

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOL. XXIII.

BALTIMORE, MARCH, 1908.

No. 3.

## *THE CYPRIAN CONQUEROR, OR THE FAITHLESS RELICT.*

*The Cyprian Conqueror, or The Faithless Relict* is an anonymous play preserved in the British Museum as *Ms. Sloane 3709*. It is a small quarto volume, bound in calf. The text is neatly penned in very black ink, upon lines made by some hard instrument. Generous margins at the sides and top are ruled in red ink, and the folios (51 in all) are numbered in red. The entire manuscript is unusually neat. The arrangement is as follows: title and *dramatis personae*; preface (12 pages); title, printed in red ink; prologue; "The Other Prologue"; body of play; epilogue; three songs.

The manuscript seems to have been copied from an older manuscript, that evidently was faulty or at least illegible in places. The copyist generally notes the lost words by dashes. For example:

Let but my sacred dust be proude  
When I am layde that you have this alloude;  
That you wed that too — — — —  
Keepe chast my bed — — — —  
Which should you once but violate or spurne<sup>1</sup> . . . .

For now Philander's dead all things are changd,  
And altered much, or else I would have rangd:  
And hearkened to thy love, but I am — — — —<sup>2</sup>  
And bent to serve the Gods: Philanthes then,  
Cannot withstand their just commands, since when  
They do command, obey we their decree.

*Phil.* That will not serve, I love ye Gods as well as thee  
Calistas now not justly — — —  
Your Godlike zeal doth say you must<sup>3</sup>  
Whom I will court, and — with a kiss.<sup>4</sup>

The copyist, clearly, was not the author. Moreover, a second person, using a different pen, and different ink, and writing in a different hand, went through the manuscript making corrections, and inserting abundant marks of punctuation.

<sup>1</sup> f. 11 verso.

<sup>2</sup> Here, it will be observed, a whole line seems to have dropped out.

<sup>3</sup> f. 14 recto.

<sup>4</sup> f. 20 verso.

He seems to have corrected slavishly by the older manuscript. The copyist wrote:

Your brother said you must dwell with me  
In Zeale, made sacred sisters, wee'l agree.

*Phil.* Madam, I am resolved,  
For that intent, I Delphos and my brother left,  
To live with you, of friend I'm not bereft.

When the person correcting the manuscript saw the incomplete line, he began to fill in thus:

Madam I am resolved for that in

Then apparently perceiving that these words belonged to the second line, he made a stroke through them and substituted four dashes, thus leaving the line as before.<sup>5</sup>

That the copy was made from the playhouse version is indicated by the great number of stage directions entered by the copyist in the margin: "Embraces her"; "Faints"; "Gives her his will"; "holds up his javelin, as he goes to strike, enter Cupid"; "strikes Philander"; "she weeps"; "kisses him"; "dyes"; "they carry him out"; "Enter Petronia, Calista and Dido all in mourning, with other mourners with the corps, goe out, and return, and take their leaves: Petronia, Calista and Dido stay"; "a fire."

Apparently the play was performed in one of the regular playhouses of London. The *Prologue* begins:

The Poet makes, and we shall act a play,  
Which, if ye like't, ye'll hav't another day.

Moreover, one of the stage directions refers unmistakably to a characteristic feature of the regular playhouse, the upper stage, or balcony. The maid comes to wake her mistress at midnight:

*Castella.* Madam make haste and rise up from  
your bed,

The houre is come, 'tis 12 o'clocke bested.

*Phaleria looks out of her chamber,  
comes down.*

<sup>5</sup> Cf. also ff. 31, 32 verso, and 48.

The second prologue shows that the play was acted more than once. Since it is of some interest, it may be quoted in full :

*The Other Prologue.*

Enter one in a greate beard like an attorney, in a gowne, and round cap, a greene bagg, and a peece of parchment sealed, spoake by another whom he had arested.

Kind judge, see ye yonder man, who looks  
All beard, bred up from's youth among the Rookes ;  
At's suite arrested I intend to plead  
Not guilty, sure he scarce can read  
A declaration hardly drawne, at least  
False lattin borrows, & paies interest  
To Ignoramus ; when in tufts and crofts,  
He infeofs in Rafters and in lofts :  
My actions good, for what he said last day,  
That we to you did act a poppet play,  
Scandalum magnatum I will it lay ;  
Besides we mony took, and some of his,  
For which inform'd master of Revels is ;  
Who would not beat this rogue ; I dare not do't,  
For feare of suits, and something else to boote :  
Unto your censures I will leave him then,  
Both to be whipt, and kick't, and jeared agen ;  
Bold barretor, before i'le go to jaile  
These, I presume, will be our judge and my bayle.

The only evidence touching on the date of composition points to a late period, probably that of Charles I. I quote from the *Preface* :

"As to ye persons in this play, I shall not mention any more of them than what I have already ; but touch a little on playes and actors, this I innocently hint on, which debauched and idle brains may chance carp at ; playes in themselves do demonstrate the vices of the age, personated by the actors ; and in my opinion nothing more takes then a lively representation of the transgressions of others, whose nefariousness we are bound rather by example, to shun then follow, nor can there be anything more efficacious and powerful to attract, by a magnetique quality from the faults of others, then in a play well humorized, and lively acted, w<sup>h</sup> I conceive is well performed in our english Theaters : some playes, I must confesse, do more incite to wickedness then abate, this sin at first when playes were instituted, was not so frequent as now, those by our forefathers being composed, to animate youth to virtue, that they might see on the stage the enormities that [are] to publicly and privately acted abroad !"

The author of the play is unknown. A clause

in the epilogue indicates that he was not a regular playwright :

Our author is a countryman  
In this play hath done what he can  
Confesses though 'tis not his skill  
Give[s] him y<sup>e</sup> game, but your good will.

The plot, as the author states in the *Preface*, is borrowed : "Having met with a story y<sup>t</sup> did something please me, coming nigh what I find daily by experience verified, I could not chuse but digest it into action." This plot is as follows : Petronia, upon the death of her husband, is so inconsolable in her grief that she vows to live ever after chaste. With her faithful maid, Dido, she takes up her residence in the tomb where her husband's body lies. At once Diana, Venus, and Cupid become interested. Diana determines to preserve this marvelous example of chastity ; whereas Cupid, egged on by Venus, resolves to demonstrate his supremacy. Nearby the tomb is a soldier, Martriatius, and his servant, Eneas, guarding the mutilated corpse of a criminal. At Cupid's instigation, Boreas raises a storm that drives Martriatius and Eneas to the tomb for shelter. Immediately Petronia falls in love with Martriatius, and the maid, Dido, with Eneas. Meanwhile, the body of the thief had been stolen away, thus bringing the life of the guard into peril. In order to save her new lover from death, Petronia mutilates the corpse of her husband and delivers it to Martriatius to take the place of the thief. The play closes with speeches by Venus and Cupid.

This, of course, is the famous story of the "Matron of Ephesus." Owing to the great vogue of the theme it would be difficult to say definitely where the author "met" with it.<sup>6</sup> I believe, however, that he had in mind the version in Petronius Arbiter.<sup>7</sup> Certainly the similarity is very close.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> For the vogue of this story see T. F. Crane, *The Exemplum of Jacques de Vitry*, p. 228 ; *Romania*, III, 175 ; Eduard Grisebach, *Die treulose Witwe, eine chinesische Novelle und ihre Wanderung durch die Welt-Litteratur*.

<sup>7</sup> *Petronii Satirae et Liber Priapeorum*. Tertium edidit Franciscus Buecheler, Berolini, 1882, p. 77.

<sup>8</sup> There seems to be no connection between the play and Chapman's earlier dramatization of the same story in *The Widow's Tears*.

The subplot of the play is as follows: Amid the great lamentation attending the death of Petronia's husband, Calista, Petronia's youngest sister, makes a vow that she will become an inmate of Diana's temple, and by a life devoted to chastity, share the grief of her sister. Later, however, she confesses to her lover, Philanthes, that she would break her oath if she dared. Philanthes, unable to persuade her to renounce her vow, tells her that he has a sister called Divina, exactly like him in face and voice, who is soon to enter Diana's temple. He requests Calista to receive Divina as a sister. Then, of course, he disguises himself as Divina, and enters the temple with Calista. The two very soon find that the Temple of Diana is devoted to the opposite of chastity. Calista confesses to Divina that if her lover were close by she would no longer keep her vow; whereupon Philanthes throws off his disguise. The lovers agree to remain in the temple, and under the appearance of inmates, enjoy their love. But the spying maid who serves the matron of the temple, having overheard this plot, reveals the situation to her mistress. The matron plans to surprise Calista and Philanthes at midnight. At the appointed time she is aroused by her maid, gets out of bed, and hurriedly throws something over her head. This proves to be nothing else than the monk's hood of her paramour, Ignatius, the confessor of the temple. She succeeds in surprising the lovers: Calista stoutly maintains that her companion is the chaste maid, Divina; the matron declares that Divina is Calista's secret lover. In the midst of the uproar, Calista, spying the hood of the confessor, accuses the matron, and thus quickly turns the tables. Caught in her guilt, the matron agrees to let the lovers off, provided they keep her fault secret.

The source of the subplot is Boccaccio's *Decamerone*, ix, 2. The short outline prefixed to the story is as follows:

"Levasi una badessa in fretta e al buio, per trovare una sua monaca, a lei accusata, col suo amante nel letto; ed essendo con lei un prete, credendosi il saltero de' veli aver posto in capo, le brache del prete vi si pose: le quali vedendo l'accusata, e fattalane accorgere, fu deliberata ed ebbe agio di starsi col suo amante."

The literary value of the piece is slight. It

is interesting chiefly as a dramatization of the Matron of Ephesus theme, already handled by Chapman in *The Widow's Tears*, and by later playwrights.

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS, JR.

Cornell University.

### MY PRONUNCIATION OF GERMAN *r*.

N. B.—Throughout this article, I shall make use of the terminology of the Visible Speech System as it is to be found in Dr. Henry Sweet's works. The symbols are, as far as expedient, taken from the alphabet of the *Association phonétique internationale*, and will enable those not acquainted with the above-mentioned system to follow my exposition.

The object of this article is to describe my natural pronunciation of *r*, as it is met with among educated speakers in the North-western part of Germany. My attention was drawn to this subject in particular by the many contradictory statements found in phonetic literature with regard to this question; and also by the difficulty experienced by foreigners trying to imitate the sound—or rather sounds—of *r* heard in the Standard pronunciation. Phoneticians, as a rule, do not afford much help in this intricate matter, most of them recommending a sort of *bogus* pronunciation, based on theories and considerations of æsthetics rather than on actual observation. Apart from this practical purpose, it will be highly interesting to the student of language to see, how a sound—being itself as far as we know derived from two sources: primitive Gmc. *r* and *z*, from older *s*—is now developing in three different directions, thus demonstrating what possibilities one must be prepared to encounter when investigating the history of human speech, especially in its more primitive stages.

The strongly trilled point-open consonant [*r*], the *litera canina* of the early orthoepists—"called thus from the snarling of dogs"—still prevalent in the country dialects as inherited from the Arian mother-tongue, was, in Standard French and German, replaced by an imitation totally different in place and form. This sound, described as the guttural or uvular *r* [*R*—identical with the so-

called Northumbrian burr<sup>1</sup>—is produced by the uvula vibrating against the back part of the tongue. It may have a disagreeable effect upon the ears of those not accustomed to it, especially in the form into which it has later on developed in my pronunciation: but, after all, it is the “received sound” of educated speech. The point-trill [r], artificially reserved to the pulpit and the stage, which is recommended by some as the “Olde and established Name” of *r*, never fails to convey the idea of rusticity when used in ordinary conversation or reading; whereas the English point-*r* [ɹ] produced with only one movement of the tongue, is absolutely unknown in Germany, thus betraying at once the nationality of the speaker.

In the same way as the original *r* was weakened in Standard English, the guttural trill was pronounced with less energy; the uvula was not made to vibrate: all that remained of the articulation was the forming of a narrow passage by the back part of the tongue against the soft palate (velum). The result may be regarded as a retracted variety of the back-open-voice [g], which actually is the sound with which Dr. Sweet renders German *r* in *all* positions, a statement which I cannot but regard with some suspicion.

In order, thus, to explain the various sounds representing older *r* in my pronunciation, it is necessary to go back to an ordinary back-open-voice [g], the voiced variety of German *ch* after back-vowels [ɔ], identical with the sound of intervocalic *g* in the same position.

This sound [g] (the voiced velar spirant) has been preserved:

1) in the beginning of words:

- e. g. *rot* [gōt];  
*Riese* [gīzə];  
*Rabe* [gābə];

<sup>1</sup>This sound is more frequent among English speakers than it is usually thought to be. When in the North of Scotland—Wright's North-eastern division—I was surprised at the exceptionally large number of persons who used this sound regularly, not as belonging to a compact mass of dialect speakers, but as an individual habit. In the Aberdeen schools, as many as 10 per cent. of the children are found using this burr, a great number of whom never acquire the proper pronunciation.

2) medially, between voiced sounds:

- a) after back-vowels, where it may not be distinguished from the written *g*:

- e. g. *waren* } [vāgn];  
       *(wagen)* }  
*Fuhre* } [fūgə];  
       *(Fuge)* }  
*bohren* } [bōgn];  
       *(Bogen)* }

- β) after front-vowels; the *g* in the same position is rendered with the front-open-voice [j], and consequently does not coincide with the *r* in the same position:

- e. g. *rühren* [gīj̃n] — *rügen* [gīj̃n];  
*leeren* [lēgn] — *legen* [lējn];  
*Möhre* [māgə] — *möge* [mājə];

- 3) finally, only as the representative of a long (or double) *r*; it is not unvoiced, unlike all other final open consonants:

- e. g. *Narr* [nag];  
*wirr* [vig].

In the neighbourhood of voiceless consonants, the sound of *r* is partially affected, being unvoiced to some extent, especially in rapid speech. This, however, being a natural process that always will occur in these cases, it is not necessary to mark it in our phonetic transcription:

- e. g. *Sarg* [zage];  
*tragen* [tgāgn];  
*frieren* [fgīgn].

There is only one exception to this rule, *r* becoming quite voiceless before *t*, developing into the back-open-breath [x], so that it coincides with the sound of *ch* after back-vowels:

- e. g. *narrt* (3 sg. prs.) } [naxt];  
       *(Nacht)* }  
*warte* (imp.) } [vaxtə];  
       *(wachte, 3 sg. prt.)* }  
*Mord* } [mɔxt];  
       *(mocht)* }

but there is a distinction in the case of front-vowels:

- e. g. *Wirt, wird* [vɪrt];  
*Wicht* [vɪçt].

When final, the short (or single) *r* has been lowered still further—so much so that no conso-



nantal friction is produced: the result is a vowel which may be described as the high-back-wide. It is the unrounded form of the short English (and German) *u* in *foot*, *put*, *book*, etc. Those trying to pronounce it by unrounding that familiar sound should be very careful not to overdo it by *spreading* the lips—which only too readily happens in a case like this. The lips should remain in what might be described as a neutral position. For this new sound I propose to use the symbol [a], which seems to be quite appropriate for a vowel the acoustic effect of which is very similar to that of [a].

e. g. *wir* [vīa];  
*ohr* [ōa];  
*flur* [flūa];  
*star* [stāa].

Final unstressed *-er*, so frequent as a termination, has assumed the same sound, the [ε] having been completely merged in the [a].

e. g. *jeder* [jēda];  
*lieber* [lība];  
*bürger* [bygja].

The same pronunciation prevails when the *-er* is followed by an inflectional *n* or *m*; thus, *-ern* and *-en* can be easily distinguished although the *r* is no longer pronounced as a consonant.

e. g. *bessern* [besan];  
*Büchern* [byçan];  
*Bürgern* [bygjan] }  
*bürgen* [bygjn]. }

HEINRICH MUTSCHMANN.

Bonn.

#### THE WORKS OF JEAN RENART, POET, AND THEIR RELATION TO GALE- RAN DE BRETAGNE. I.

In an article which was found among the papers of Gaston Paris, and published a few years ago in the *Romania*,<sup>1</sup> the suggestion is offered that the Jean Renart, who wrote the *Lai de l'Ombre*,<sup>2</sup> is

<sup>1</sup> Vol. xxxii, 481-551. See particularly pp. 487, 488.

<sup>2</sup> Edited by Joseph Bédier, Fribourg, 1890.

the author also of the romance of *Escoufle*,<sup>3</sup> and probably the writer to whom we owe the poem of *Guillaume de Dole*.<sup>4</sup> This idea had already been advanced by Paul Meyer,<sup>5</sup> with especial reference to *Ombre* and *Escoufle*, and seems to have been entertained somewhat later by Adolph Mussafia in regard to *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole*.<sup>6</sup> Neither Meyer nor Mussafia coincide with Paris' view to its entire extent, nor do they agree with each other in their choice of poems, but their statements and proofs so overlap that we may take it for granted that a new study of the subject would lead them to a practical unanimity of opinion. And this opinion would be the one expressed by Gaston Paris.

Should this belief in the common authorship of *Ombre*, *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole* become general, and the three poems be regarded as the work of one and the same man, then Jean Renart, who is named only in *Ombre*, takes rank among the best French poets of the Middle Ages. Indeed, he might be safely assigned a place second only to Wace, Marie de France, Benoît de Sainte-More, Thomas and Chrétien de Troyes. *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole* are counted among the most important of the *romans d'aventure*. The popularity of *Ombre* is attested by its presence in not less than six manuscripts. Consequently we are doing only tardy justice to Jean Renart in calling him from out the crowd of minor poets to a seat among the greater ones. At the same time, in restoring to him what is his own we are diminishing, to our regret, the already limited number of talented men who were engaged in the cultivation of the vernacular. Three poets of considerable ability would be combined in one. The literary reputation of Jean Renart, therefore, is not alone concerned in the decision that may be reached. The consideration in which the educated classes of the day held composition in the mother tongue is also involved to a certain ex-

<sup>3</sup> Edited by H. Michelant and P. Meyer for the *Société des anciens textes français*, Paris, 1894.

<sup>4</sup> Edited by G. Servois for the *Société des anciens textes français*, Paris, 1893.

<sup>5</sup> See Introduction to *Escoufle*, pp. xli-l.

<sup>6</sup> See *Sitzungsberichte der phil.-hist. Classe der kaiserl. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Vienna, 1896, Abh. xiv; 1897, Abh. vii. In latter article, p. 33, n. 1.

tent, and a solution of the question of the origin of these three poems, common or otherwise, would aid us in estimating the valuation set on French literature at the height of its Medieval flowering.

Before attempting to collect the evidence cited by the three scholars mentioned—Gaston Paris does not in fact adduce any—and supplementing it by any further details, it may be advisable to refer to the statement made some years ago in this periodical,<sup>7</sup> that the author of *Guillaume de Dole* was acquainted with an episode of *Escoufle*, and near the end of the poem made a comparison between the villain in *Escoufle*, the hawk, and the villain of his own narrative, the senechal. This knowledge of *Escoufle* on the part of the author of *Guillaume de Dole* not only proves that *Escoufle* was the earlier poem of the two, but also indicates a familiarity with the story which might be expected of one who had had a share in its composition. Such a reference to another work might be prompted by pride of authorship.

However, the first step to take in order to arrive at a more exact comprehension of the mutual relation of *Ombre*, *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole* would be to study all three together, rather than any two of the three, as has been done heretofore. Now, the most striking evidence of likeness or unlikeness would be presented by their versification. Paul Meyer has already called attention to many correspondences.<sup>8</sup> We need only to add to his citations. The poems are unequal in length. *Ombre* contains less than a thousand lines, *Guillaume de Dole* numbers over five thousand six hundred, *Escoufle* runs to more than nine thousand. Yet in spite of this inequality their percentage of broken couplets remains practically the same: 60% for *Ombre*, 58% for *Guillaume de Dole*, 62% for *Escoufle*. The proportion of three-line sentences<sup>9</sup> which follow the break in the couplet is also uniformly small: 2% in *Ombre*, 7% in *Guillaume de Dole*, 3.5% in *Escoufle*. On the other hand, the amount of overflow verse in all three poems is unusual; as many as twenty overflows in the thousand lines of *Ombre*, and fifteen in a thousand for sections of *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole*. In the ratio of feminine to

masculine rimes *Guillaume de Dole*, with 38%, stands midway between *Escoufle* and *Ombre*.<sup>10</sup>

Other and minor correspondences in versification may be seen in the general prevalence of sentences in two and four lines, in the recurrence of a caesura which breaks the eight syllable verse into 3 + 5, in the number of monosyllabic rime-words in *a* (also *ce* in *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole*), and in the employment of the *tirade lyrique*, or couplets in monorime. Of this last feature of style, there are two instances in *Ombre*, nine in *Escoufle* and eight in *Guillaume de Dole*. From so many and so consistent similarities we may draw the conclusion, that from the point of view of their prosody the three poems not only belong to the same poetical school but are the work of one and the same poet.

This conclusion, which proceeds from likenesses in rime and rhythm, receives strong support in two peculiar expressions which are common to the three poems, but which are rarely found in the literature of the day. The one relates to marking time by the Landit fair at St. Denis:

Se Deus me lait veoir l'Endit (text lund). *Ombre*, 370.

Et si voit que jusqu'al l'Endit. *Escoufle*, 6538.

Vos ne verrez devant l'Endit. *Guillaume de Dole*, 1593.

The other tells how the poet first describes a castle or town, which his characters are approaching, from a *monjoie*:

Tant qu'il vinrent a la monjoie

Du chastel o cele manoit.

*Ombre*, 224, 225.

Et tant qu'il sont a la monjoie

Venu de la Mahommerie.

*Escoufle*, 458, 459.

Tant ont erré k'a la monjoie

Vindrent de Tol en Loheraine.

*Escoufle*, 4354, 4355. Cf. 7568, 7569.

Tant a erré qu'a la monjoie<sup>11</sup>

Vint de Maience mont matin.

*Guillaume de Dole*, 4183, 4184.

These two instances are the only ones we have noted where expressions coincide in all three poems. There are, however, a number of phrases common to any two of the three. Some have already been

<sup>7</sup> Vol. XIII, col. 347, 348.

<sup>8</sup> *Escoufle*, pp. xlii-liv.

<sup>9</sup> See *Modern Philology*, vol. IV, 662-664.

<sup>10</sup> See *Escoufle*, p. 1.

<sup>11</sup> In the passages cited from *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole* the word *monjoie* rimes with *joie*. For the passage in *Ombre*, three mss. read *joie* for the rime-word, but the editor has preferred the reading *voie* of the other three.

quoted by Meyer and Mussafia. We have made a few gleanings in their footsteps.

Common to *Ombre* and *Escoufle* is the coupling of *pitiés* with *gentillece* (sometimes also with *franchise*) :

Gentillece, pitiés, largece. *Ombre*, 210.

Et que gentillece et pitiés. *Ombre*, 362.

Mais se gentillece et pitiés

Vos prenoit de moi, et franchise

Ja nus qui d'amors chant ne lise.

*Ombre*, 498-500.

S'onques pitié ne gentelisse

Ot en vos ne point de franchise.

*Escoufle*, 1509, 1510.

En pitié et en gentelise

Que cascuns li dist qu'il eslise.

*Escoufle*, 2269, 2270.

Common to *Ombre* and *Guillaume de Dole* are the rime-words, one whole line and parts of the other two, in the following citations :

Mal fait qui destruit et confont

Ce dont il puet estre al deseure !

Trop me cort force d'amors seure.

*Ombre*, 776-778.

Ha ! dame, mal fet qui confont

Ce dont il puet estre au deseure !

Tant li prient et corent seure.

*Guillaume de Dole*, 4970-4972.

Common to *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole* is this line which describes Rumor, together with the rime-word of the preceding line and the rime syllable of the line following :

N'ot entre eus ne laide parole.

Renomée qui partout vole

En a porté la novele.

*Escoufle*, 8515-8517.

Quant il ot dit ceste parole.

Rénomée, qui partot vole,<sup>12</sup> cf. l. 937.

Si m'amentut ceste pucele.

*Guillaume de Dole*, 5122-5124.

<sup>12</sup> The author (or authors) of our poems did not, however, invent this saying. A generation before it had appeared in Wace :

Renomee qui partot vole,

Et qui de poi fait grant parole.

*Brut*, 4663, 4664.

Benolt de Sainte-More may have inherited it from Wace :

Renomee qui partot vole

En a tenue grant parole.

*Troie*, 27409, 27410 (Joly's edition).

Definite allusions to *Troie* are made both in *Escoufle* (see

Another survival of *Escoufle*'s phrases is met with in *Guillaume de Dole*, in the repetition :

C'est m'esperance, c'est ma joie,

C'est mes jouiaus, c'est mes soulas.

*Escoufle*, 1862, 1863.

C'est m'esperance, c'est ma vie,

C'est mes joiaus, c'est ma santez.

*Guillaume de Dole*, 3037, 3038.

Individual words peculiar to *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole* include the participle *caleboté*—already noticed by Paul Meyer in the Errata to the vocabulary of *Escoufle*—and the noun *siècle* with the meaning of "pleasure" :

. . . Fortune a envie

De lor bon siecle et de lor vie.

*Escoufle*, 4467, 4468.

Qui onques fu en tels estors

Bien puet savoir quel siecle il orent.

*Guillaume de Dole*, 214, 215.

Puis que cil Guillaume fu nez,

N'ot si bon siecle a nul sejour.

*Guillaume de Dole*, 3431, 3432. Cf. 5488, 5501.

The similarity of these citations possesses a significance which is easily understood, but in order to appreciate its full force it is advisable to recall here some of the observations made by Paul Meyer and Mussafia. The former had found the expressions *ce que*, *lues que* and *que que*<sup>13</sup> common to the three poems, and the latter a peculiar meaning of the noun *manière*.<sup>14</sup> Paul Meyer had also noted these lines from *Ombre* and *Escoufle* :

La colors li croist et avive. *Ombre*, 374.

Sa colors li croist et avive. *Escoufle*, 2982.

ll. 112, 113, etc.) and *Guillaume de Dole* (see ll. 40, 5318-5336).—In Wace's chronicle of *Rou*, which is later than *Brut* by a decade or more, Rumor is called "Novele" :

C'est une chose que novele

Que molt est errante e isnele.

*Rou*, 4945, 4946. Cf. 5905, etc.

Why did Wace change his phrase? Was it under the influence of Chrétien de Troyes? Or did Chrétien adopt the words of *Rou* in preference to the description of *Brut*?

Mout est tost alee novele :

Que rien nule n'est si isnele.

*Érec*, 4939, 4940. Cf. 6176.

Logic would perforce require an imitation of Chrétien by Wace.

<sup>13</sup> See *Escoufle*, p. xlviii. For *que que* in *Guillaume de Dole*, see vocabulary to Servois' edition.

<sup>14</sup> *Op. cit.*, 1897, Abh. VII, pp. 18, 19.

And Mussafia had corrected the following couplets in *Ombre* and *Guillaume de Dole*<sup>15</sup>:

Qui mout li toche près del cuer :  
 "Sire, fait ele, alons la fuer.  
*Ombre*, 719, 720.  
 De ce qui plus li touche au cuer !  
 Cel jor fesoit chanter la fuer.  
*Guillaume de Dole*, 1329, 1330.

Among the coincidences of phrase found by Mussafia in *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole*<sup>16</sup> are these sentences which disclose quite clearly the workings of the poet's memory :

N'onques ne fu ne vis ne nés  
 Qui oïst issir de sa bouche  
 I. sairement n'un lait reproche.  
*Escoufle*, 2042-2044.  
 Dës cele hore que il nez fu,  
 N'oï nuls issir de sa bouche  
 Grant serement ne lait reproche.  
*Guillaume de Dole*, 44-46.  
 Nature les prent et remort<sup>17</sup>  
 K'il les a norris et il lui.  
*Escoufle*, 2274, 2275.  
 Nature les prent et remort<sup>17</sup>  
 Qu'il a entr'ax norriz esté.  
*Guillaume de Dole*, 128, 129.

It may now be claimed that the results reached by the study of the phrasing and vocabulary of *Ombre*, *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole* confirm the opinions which were based on the comparison of their versification. That they are the work of one and the same poet seems proven, so far as internal evidence can prove anything. Nor is there any difficulty on the subjective side. The spirit and purpose of the three poems harmonize. Their literary and social views are similar. It will also be noticed that the correspondence in their phrases occurs at unimportant points, by accident apparently rather than by design. There does not seem to be any intention to repeat a clause once coined when the same situation arises again. On the contrary, the likenesses of expression recur at unexpected places, and for the most part with variations, which could be attributed to lapses in the poet's memory, an unconscious and not a voluntary repetition. In fact, the im-

pression received from these very variations, these approximations to phrases and lines which had already been formulated, is that the poet made a distinct effort not to repeat himself. Such an idea on his part receives considerable confirmation from a study of the similes in the poems. Even where the comparison remains the same they do not correspond. So with the proverbs employed. Two of *Ombre* (ll. 384-386 ; 716, 717) are found also in *Guillaume de Dole* (ll. 3464, 3465 ; 1409, 1410). But their wording is quite different. None of the proverbs of *Escoufle* do service elsewhere.

Gaston Paris' assertion, therefore, may be taken as well grounded, and Jean Renart may be safely written down as the author of *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole*. He had himself marked *Ombre* as his own. Should this literary paternity be conceded, the question of the order of composition of the three poems, though of subordinate interest, would arise. It is hardly possible, in view of what has already been said,<sup>18</sup> to dispute the seniority of *Escoufle* in reference to *Guillaume de Dole*. But what of *Ombre*? Is there no way of determining its relative position? Both Meyer and Paris believe that *Ombre* is later than *Escoufle*, because of the abrupt manner in which the death of the hawk is referred to in *Ombre*. Without any preparation or other literary allusion, the poet of *Ombre* suddenly illustrates his argument by citing William's act of violence :

Par Guillaume qui despieca  
 L'escofle et arst, un a un membre,  
 Si com li contes nos remembre,  
 Puet on prover que je di voir.  
*Ombre*, 22-25.

Meyer and Paris think that this unexpected citation is to be credited to pride of authorship, and it would appear that their reasoning must be correct. The only argument against their position is given by *Escoufle* itself. There the poet carefully distinguishes between his "roumans" and the "contes" which supplied his plot :

Mais c'est drois que li roumans ait  
 Autretel non comme li contes.  
*Escoufle*, 9074, 9075.  
 Pour çou si di c'on ne doit mie  
 Blasner le rouman pour le non.  
*Escoufle*, 9098, 9099. Cf. 9056, 9059.

<sup>15</sup> *Op. cit.*, 1897, Abh. VII, p. 8.

<sup>16</sup> *Op. cit.*, 1896, Abh. XIV, pp. 30, 61 ; 1897, Abh. VII, pp. 28, 33, n. 1, 35, 43.

<sup>17</sup> In both poems *mort* is the rime-word with *remort*.

<sup>18</sup> See note 7, above.



After he had taken so much trouble to discriminate between his source and his own poem, it seems singular that the author should cast aside the discrimination entirely. The line in *Ombre* does not demand the sacrifice.

On the other hand, in favor of Meyer's and Paris' view is the signing of *Ombre* by its author. If Jean Renart wrote *Escoufle* and *Guillaume de Dole* he did not concern himself with transmitting that action to posterity. But he does claim *Ombre* and weaves his name into its lines, so that there should be no possibility of the *lai* becoming anonymous. Now the custom among Medieval writers seems to have been to establish a reputation before openly assuming literary responsibility. Their first works would be marketed without any other signature than the one provided by the heading or ending of the manuscript. Whether this custom holds good in the case of Jean Renart or not, it nevertheless occasions surprise to see that his longer and apparently more important poems furnish no hint as to the identity of their composer. We would, therefore, presume that they were earlier than the signed poem. At all events, they were less popular and were known to a smaller circle. The testimony of the manuscripts extant proves the greater vogue of *Ombre*.

Possibly because of the apparent priority of *Escoufle* to *Ombre*, Gaston Paris was led to set the composition of the former poem as far back as 1185. This date seems too early for various reasons. One is that the spirit of *Escoufle* is no longer the spirit of the poems of the eighth and ninth decades of the twelfth century. Its interest in the trials of true love is slight. That interest is subordinated to a desire to portray social customs and the life of the day.<sup>19</sup> Again, the reference to the plot of *Escoufle* in *Guillaume de Dole* would show that only a short interval separated the two poems. Servois dates *Guillaume de Dole* between 1199 and 1201. *Escoufle* must have been written by 1198, because of the complimentary reference to the Countess of Champagne contained in ll. 5614, 5615. This countess could hardly be other than Mary, the patroness of poets, who died in 1198. Besides, *Escoufle* is to be sent to a count of Hainault. Gaston Paris evidently took

this count to be Baldwin V, who became count of Flanders also in 1191. But because of the proximity of *Escoufle* to *Guillaume de Dole* this dedication must be intended for Baldwin VI, who became count in 1195 and who left Hainault, in 1202, for Venice and Constantinople. Therefore, *Escoufle* could be plausibly assigned to the years 1196-1198. *Guillaume de Dole* follows after in 1199-1201 (?). If *Ombre* follows *Guillaume de Dole*, as well as *Escoufle* (it may, of course, come between them), then the development of Jean Renart's poetic talent took place between 1195 and 1205 approximately.

F. M. WARREN.

Yale University.

#### SIR THOPAS AND SIR GUY. I.

In seeking for parallels to the phraseology of Chaucer's *Sir Thopas*, it is natural to turn first to the romances which Chaucer himself mentions, *Octavian Imperator*,<sup>1</sup> *Perceval*,<sup>2</sup> *Horn Childe*, *Ypotys*, *Bevis*, *Sir Guy*, *Sir Libeaux*.<sup>3</sup> A study of these in the earliest extant English versions gives the following results: to the phraseology of *Sir Perceval*, there is but one parallel in that of

<sup>1</sup> Say, fellow, who shal hunten here  
Quod I: and he answerde ageyn,  
Sir, themperour Octovien.

*Book of the Duchesse*, ll. 366 ff.

This is generally taken as a reference to the romance. See Skeat's *Chaucer*, I, p. 472; Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, N. Y., 1892, 2, 302.

<sup>2</sup> *Sir Thopas*, l. 214 ff. Skeat, iv, 190 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Men speke of romances of prys,  
Of Horn child and of Ypotys,  
Of Bevis and Sir Gy,  
Of Sir Libeux and Pleyn-damour.

*Sir Thopas*, ll. 186 f.

Of these, the *Ypotys* we have is not a romance in our sense of the word, but a didactic poem with nothing about it to suggest its place in such a list. It is, of course, possible that Chaucer knew something else of the name, but "romance" was an inclusive term in his day (see Skeat's note, v, 198). Chaucer himself applies it to Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (*Book of the Duchesse*, ll. 44 ff.); and the translator of Grosseteste's *De Principio Creationis* calls that serious work a romance (Horstmann, *Altengl. Legenden*, N. F., 1881, p. 349). *Pleyn-damour*, if a separate romance, has never been identified (cf. Skeat, v, 199).

<sup>19</sup> See *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XIII, cols. 345, 346.

*Sir Thopas*, ten to that of *Octavian*, none to that of *Horn Childe* or *Ypotys*; quite otherwise is it with *Libeaus Desconus*, *Bevis of Hampton*, and *Guy of Warwick*, where so many correspondences of phrase occur, that, taken together, they make it most probable that Chaucer knew the very English versions accessible to us. In other romances not mentioned by him, are also to be found many parallel phrases. In one of these, *Sir Degrevant*,<sup>4</sup> there are some lines very suggestive in relation to the phrase, "of popes and of cardinales."<sup>5</sup> It is to *Guy of Warwick*,<sup>6</sup> however, that I would direct particular attention, since the number of phrases in it that are parallel to those of *Sir Thopas* far exceed the number of such phrases in any other one romance, and other interesting resemblances are worthy of notice.

That *Guy of Warwick* had a wide circulation is proved by the numerous versions which still exist. From the shadows in which its origins are lost, it first emerges to our eyes in a French version of which eight manuscripts remain.<sup>7</sup> There exist, in whole or in part, four Middle English translations,<sup>8</sup> the oldest of which, that in the Auchinleck MS., written early in the fourteenth century, I use as the basis of comparison. The frequent mention of the tale in literature and its persistence in varying form also attest its popularity. Its hero became a national boast. His name is often coupled, as by Chaucer, with that of Sir Bevis, another reputed Englishman of valor.<sup>9</sup> In *Richard Cœur de Lion*,<sup>10</sup> the romances of Guy and Bevis are associated with those of fifteen other heroes, ancient and mediæval. In *Sir Generides*,<sup>11</sup>

he is named with Tristram and Bevis, Perceval and Gawain. Langland<sup>12</sup> has a line—

Felyce, hir fayrnesse fel him al to sklaundre—

which seems to allude to a well-known moral drawn from the disdainful beauty of Guy's wife. In the *Mirroure of Life*,<sup>13</sup> translated from Latin into English in the latter half of the fourteenth century occurs this interesting passage :

I warne gow ferst ate begynyng,  
Y wyle make gow no weyn carpyng  
Of dedes of armes, ne of amouré  
As doth menstral and jesteres,  
That maketh carpyng in many place  
Of Octovyan and Isuinbrace,  
And of many other gestes  
Namely when they come to festes ;  
Ne of the lyf of Bewys of Hamptone  
That was a knygt of gret renone,  
Ne of syre Gy of Werewyke  
Alle gif it mygte some men lyke.

The popularity, shown by such frequent, casual reference, did not end with Chaucer's generation. This very persistence is in itself a proof of the earlier vogue. Still another proof is the use of Sir Guy's name to attract readers to serious works. Printed among the writings of Richard Rolle is a sermon on the virtues, put into the mouth of Alcuin and addressed to Guy of Warwick.<sup>14</sup> The title *Speculum Gy de Warewyke*<sup>15</sup> was given to a book entirely didactic in nature. The fame of Guy spread from England and France into remoter regions. It is alluded to in the Spanish romance of *Tirante il Blanco*, supposed to have been written not long after 1430.<sup>16</sup> Dugdale says, on the not unimpeachable authority of Rous, that about 1410, the Saracens of Jerusalem showed great hospitality to a certain Lord Beauchamp, because he was descended from the famous Guy of Warwick, whose story they had in their own language.<sup>17</sup>

<sup>4</sup> *Thornton Romances*, ed. Halliwell, London, 1845, pp. 177 ff.

<sup>5</sup> *Sir Degrevant*, ll. 1818 f., 1829 f., 1842 ff.

<sup>6</sup> *Romance of Guy of Warwick*, ed. Zupitza, from Auchinleck and Caius MSS., E. E. T. S., London, 1883.

<sup>7</sup> Zupitza, *Romance of Guy of Warwick*, from Camb. MS., E. E. T. S., London, 1875-76, p. v.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>9</sup> In *Sir Bevis of Hampton* there is an interesting reference to Guy of Warwick, quoted from the romance itself :

Gij a Warwik, ich understonde  
Slonj a dragoun in Norþ-Homberlonde.

*Bevis of Hampton*, ed. Kolbing, E. E. T. S., London, 1885, ll. 2607 f.

<sup>10</sup> Weber, *Metrical Romances*, Edinburgh, 1810, 2. 6659 ff.

<sup>11</sup> *Sir Generides*, ll. 13 ff. (ed. Furnivall, for Roxburghe Club, Hertford, 1865).

<sup>12</sup> Langland, *Piers the Plowman*, ed. Skeat (Oxford, 1886), l. PP. b 12. 47, n. p. 181.

<sup>13</sup> *Speculum Vitæ* (*Englische Studien*, 7, 469), ll. 36 ff.

<sup>14</sup> Richard Rolle of Hampole, *Works*, ed. Horstmann, London, 1895, 2, 24 ff. It is, of course, quite possible that there were other Guys of repute, whose passing fame was absorbed into that of the great Guy.

<sup>15</sup> *Speculum Gy (donis) de Warewyke*, ed. Georgiana Morrell, E. E. T. S., London, 1898.

<sup>16</sup> Warton-Hazlitt, *History of English Poetry*, London, 1871, 2, 144.

<sup>17</sup> Dugdale, *Antiquities of Warwickshire*, London, 1730, 1, 374 ff.

One great cause of Guy's English popularity was the appeal his story made not only to the people's reverence for poetry and love of adventure, but to their national pride. A hero of their own race, his greatest deed had been wrought for their deliverance from a foreign foe. Few ordinary folk doubted the substantial truth of the story, or failed to look with credulous reverence upon the relics among them, Guy's gigantic armor and the rib of the dun cow. In the eighteenth century, Dugdale,<sup>18</sup> with delightful simplicity, rebukes all doubters: "Yet those who are more considerate will neither doubt the one nor the other, [existence and deeds] in as much as it hath been so usual with our ancient historians for the encouragement of after-ages unto bold attempts to set forth the exploits of worthy men with the highest encomiums imaginable; and therefore should we for that cause be so conceited as to explode it, all History of those times might as well be vilified."<sup>19</sup>

If Guy's story, then, was so well known and so well beloved, it is surely natural that Chaucer, too, should have known it well, and named it among his "romances of prys." When we consider the character of the tale, it need by no means surprise us if he should also think it a fit subject for parody, with its twelve thousand lines of mechanical, jingling verse, full of stock narrative phrases. To discover whether or not he made any special use of it, we must put the romance and the parody side by side. This I shall endeavor to do, taking first the plots of the two tales, if one can use the word *plot* in connection with a fragment like *Sir Thopas*.

The story of *Sir Guy* is briefly as follows: Guy, son of the powerful steward of Earl Rohant, falls desperately in love with Felice, the earl's daughter, for whom he weeps and languishes. Scornful at first, she at last has pity on his distress, and gives him some hope that he may win her by prowess. He at once sets off in search of fame. When he returns with great renown, won

in Normandy, Spain and Germany, he meets only an approving demand for greater achievement. After five years more of as stern a life as hero ever led, full of fierce fights and valiant conquests, he turns once more toward England, performing prodigies on the way. Having, by bravery and cleverness, secured peace for the emperor of Germany, he turns back to answer an appeal of the Emperor of the East for succor against deadly attacks of the Saracens. The frightful struggle is ended only by decided action on the part of Guy, who insults and beheads the Sultan at his own table. The lover's memory of Felice seems to have faded a little during this stirring life, for Guy is on the point of marrying the emperor's daughter, when he remembers, just in time, and swoons at the altar. Again he sets out for England, rescuing lost knights and ladies on his way. When he finally reaches his own country, after an absence of seven years, he can not still go at once to his love. He must first slay a dragon of the most frightful and deadly sort, which is devastating Northumberland. With all these labors and achievements Felice deigns to be satisfied, and marries her hero amid great rejoicing. With the marriage, the second part of the romance opens.

Guy, after fifteen days of bliss, is seized with remorse when he remembers all he has done for love of a woman, and nothing for love of God. In spite of his wife's tears, he sets forth in pilgrim's habit for Jerusalem. In a doubly-fierce battle with a terrible Saracen, he rescues the fifteen sons of an old knight. It is, however, when he returns to England after some years that he meets the crowning opportunity of his life, at the critical moment when the sovereignty of the king and the independence of the people are staked upon a combat with Colbrand, the giant champion of the Danes.<sup>20</sup> Led by a dream, the king calls upon the unrecognized pilgrim for help. Here Guy wins his last glorious victory, here, too, he wins his undying place in the heart of his country.

<sup>18</sup> Dugdale, *Antiquities of Warwickshire*, London, 1730, I, 374.

<sup>19</sup> Dugdale assigns Guy's death to 929 A. D., Lydgate, in his redaction of the story, to 927. This is apparently to fit it into the reign of King Athelstan, 925-941.

<sup>20</sup> Shakespeare's two references to the tale honor Colbrand as much as Guy:

... Colbrand the giant, that same mighty man.

*King John*, I, 1, 225.

I am not Samson nor Sir Guy, nor Colbrand. . . .

*Henry VIII*, v, 4, 22.

Nine months later, a saint's death crowns the hermit's holy life, and one thousand and seven angels bear his soul to heaven.

Such a diffuse and extended life-history as Sir Guy's cannot, it is evident, come into close comparison with the story of Chaucer's hero, so rudely interrupted almost at the beginning. In the short recital, no special incidents suggest those in *Sir Guy*, yet in details there are many points of resemblance. We know less of Guy's personal appearance than of Sir Thopas's, but the hair of both is bright yellow.<sup>21</sup> Both have been educated to hunt and hawk; riding "bi river" is emphasized more than once in *Sir Guy*. It is only the plebeian accomplishments of Sir Thopas which have no counterparts in Sir Guy, about whom there is nothing plebeian. Sir Thopas's first warlike adventure is with a giant of terrible threats.<sup>22</sup> Encounters with giants are a commonplace of all mediæval romance, but they are specially prominent in Sir Guy's history. Beside lesser duels, the crowning point of his

career is the fight with the giant Colbrond. That Sir Thopas, in politely postponing the combat till he is better armed, precisely reverses the practice of Sir Guy is one of the points of the parody. In his courteous "if I may," he uses a favorite phrase of Guy's. The feast and arming, which Chaucer makes so prominent, have frequent parallels in Sir Guy, but these are too common in romance to be significant. Like Sir Thopas, Guy rides out for adventure through more than one "fair forest" where he meets at least one "wilde best."<sup>23</sup> It is more to the point that in one wood, he is, like Sir Thopas, so affected by the song of the birds that "in gret longing" he loses himself and his way.<sup>24</sup> Like Chaucer's hero, he is most attractive to ladies, but indifferent to all but one. Though thirty maidens are enamored of his beauty, he regards only Felice. In all these correspondences, there is none so peculiar to these two romances as to be in itself convincing proof of their close connection, but they are worth noting. In a few incidents of *Sir Thopas*, there is a closer resemblance to some other romance, specially *Bevis of Hampton*, but in no other tale can be found half so many parallels.

There are also some points emphasized in Chaucer's parody which are very prominent in *Guy of Warwick*. One of these is that Guy is constantly riding or about to ride. At first, after he has been wounded, he comes

soft rideing  
Upon a mulet ambling,<sup>25</sup>

but later it is the rescued lady whom he puts upon the "mule amblinde." He is either leaping on his horse without stirrup<sup>26</sup> or bestriding his steed. The

<sup>21</sup> Chaucer emphasizes the nose of his hero:  
And I yow telle in good certayn  
He hadde a semely nose.

*Sir Thopas*, ll. 17 f.

There are two curious allusions in Skelton which might suggest perhaps a popular emphasis upon the noses of both heroes:

She callyd yow Syr Gy of Gaunt  
Nosyd lyke an olifaunt.

Skelton, *Works*, ed. Dyce, London,  
1843, I, 122.

and

Your semely snowte doth passe  
Hawked as an hawkys beke, lyke Syr Topyas.

*Ib.*, p. 117.

The "of Gaunt" is puzzling if the reference is to our hero. There may have been other Guys. Considering the use of the word "seemly," the Sir Topyas seems surely Chaucer's or could there have been an earlier *Topas*, known to Chaucer but not to us, where the nose was prominent?

<sup>22</sup> Warton quotes "an ingenious critic" who says: "It is further to be noted that the Boke of the Giant Olyphant and Chylde Thopas was not a fiction of his own but a story of antique fame and very celebrated in the days of chivalry; so that nothing could better suit the poet's design of discrediting the old romances, than the choice of this venerable legend, for the vehicle of his ridicule upon them." (Warton-Hazlitt, 2, p. 363.) Unfortunately, Warton does not name the critic, and, as Hazlitt observes, no one else seems to know the "story of antique fame."

<sup>23</sup> Here, of course, the rhyme and association are so natural that there are many examples, cf.

They ryden forth to a wyld forest  
Ther was many a wyld best.

*Octavian Imperator*, ll. 283 f. (Weber, *Met. Rom.*  
Edinburgh, 1810; v. 3, p. 245 ff.)

<sup>24</sup> *Sir Thopas*, ll. 61 ff. *Guy of Warwick*, ll. 4519 ff.  
<sup>25</sup> *Guy of Warwick*, 1328 f.

<sup>26</sup> That this mounting without stirrup was felt as characteristic of Guy is shown by a speech of the king in the so-called ballad of *Guy and Colbrond*. When he sees the agility of the unknown champion that

Without any stirropp verament  
Into the saddle he sprent,



other knights, too, are frequently leaping upon horses. When we turn to *Sir Thopas*, we find the hero's steed mentioned seven times in two hundred lines. It is, however, in contrast rather than resemblance to Guy, for he climbs into his saddle, and his horse "gooth an ambel" like Guy's mule.<sup>27</sup> The giant threatens to kill his steed, precisely the calamity that overtakes Guy in most of his encounters.

CAROLINE STRONG.

Radcliffe College.

#### ANTON REISER AND ASMUS SEMPER.

A hundred years makes but little difference in that endlessly interesting human document, the soul of a boy. And so Otto Ernst's *Asmus Sempers Jugendland* and Karl Philipp Moritz' *Anthon Reiser* offer much in common. Both of these stories are autobiographic in tone and each depicts with great minuteness of psychological detail the growth and striving of its hero. The culmination of his inner combat in artistic expression is the aim of each book. The boys are both North Germans. Reiser is a Hannoverian and Semper comes from a miserable cigarmaking suburb of Hamburg. Each is poor and in each the "Bildungsdrang" is all-powerful.

*Asmus Semper* is a product of the nineteenth century. It is a simple story told with great love and not a little humor and deserves to be better known to the American public thru the medium of a good translation. Asmus is endowed by nature with a wonderful memory, the gift of absolute pitch, a fine sense of form and color, but above all with a good character and an unwavering instinct for the better things of this world. His family, too, is very interesting and its fortunes and little tragedies form

he remarks,

I neuer knew no man that soe cold have done,  
but old Sir Guy of Warw[i]cke towne  
that curteous knight himselfe.

*Percys' Folio MS.*, ed. Hales and Furnivall,  
London, 1868, II, p. 532.

<sup>27</sup> *Sir Thopas*, II. 86, 174.

a very dear and very German background and one that is close to nature's heart. The Sempers are a very naïve set. They love their Goethe, their Schiller and their Grillparzer with a natural estheticism, and even in their darkest days can read *Faust* or sing arias from Mozart. They demand the necessities of life from fate but also its poetry, its light and its adornment. They dream; they are born transcendentalists, and Ludwig Semper, the father, lives as much in the world of might-have-been as any child in a fairy tale. Asmus has more stamina than the rest of the "Semperei" and it is his intellectual vigor which finally is to raise the family to a higher level.

The story is not, however, a "Bildungsroman" after the manner of Wilhelm Meister, nor is there any plot. Like many of Otto Ernst's other works the interest is in the boy nature with a certain emphasis on pedagogy. It presents Asmus always as a boy; he plays as a boy, feels and thinks as a boy, does wrong as a boy and pays penance as sensitive boys do. One never forgets the boy nature, one feels its sacredness and sympathizes with it. And it grows, it takes on new volume, learns with a fierce joy in knowing, and feels the whole thrill of the world without any decadent precocity of mind or body. The story dallies in the by-paths of nature and the effect of each flower, each facet of the world at every turn that Asmus makes, is pictured with frank pleasure. It is especially in a lovely appreciation of nature that the book should appeal to the America of to-day, for the soul of Asmus is in accord with the world soul and he hears, as we are hearing, the call of the great Pan.

It is quite another side that Moritz' book presents. This story which is most undeservedly forgotten by the great mass of the German reading public,<sup>1</sup> had a decided effect on Goethe who spent much time with Moritz in Rome and who admired him greatly. He attests to the influence of *Anthon Reiser* on his own *Wilhelm Meister*. *Anthon Reiser* was published from 1785-90; the first four parts were

<sup>1</sup> See, however, the recent sympathetic account of Moritz in *Z. für d. dt. Unterricht*, Bd. 21, Hefte 9-10.

written by Moritz himself and maintain a slight incognito. After Moritz' death in 1793, a fifth part was added by a friend. This last part is merely a straight biography of Moritz and tho written with great affection, has no literary interest. In the portions written by Moritz the value lies in the detailed self-examination to which he subjected himself and which he recorded with the utmost fidelity and verisimilitude.

Moritz was a most interesting character whose power of introspection was appalling. His book is in every way as interesting as Rousseau's *Confessions* and awakens a deeper sympathy for Moritz-Reiser than one feels for Rousseau, because Moritz had far more moral character than Rousseau, and his troubles are due to a remarkable extent to fate. As Erich Schmidt has pointed out in another connection, the fate element is so strong in Moritz that a fate motif could be predicated for his drama *Blunt*, long before that work was really known. Fate, then, and the crushing weight of a loveless environment are the main factors in his life.

Yet Moritz, the child, was remarkably like Asmus Semper and the early portions of his story read like a companion piece to the modern book. But where the Sempers were free-thinking and followed a policy of *laissez-faire*, the environment of Reiser was narrowly pietistic and so the poor child was soon taught to regard all play as a sin. A touching instance of this is the anecdote of the wheelbarrow. The child likes to play with a barrow that he finds in the yard, but to atone for this sin of enjoyment, imagines that he is wheeling the Christ Child about in the cart. With Him he holds earnest conversations and innocently enough excuses himself with a prayer when he grows tired of trundling. But the process of grinding all life and affection out of the boy begins early and the steps are shown with scientific accuracy.

Then, too, the landscape is shown only in its drearier aspects. It is the cruel north with its cold hard winters, its poverty, its hunger, its accumulated despair. The great beauty of the winter Moritz could not see, and even the

summer was for him less a friend and companion than an environment. Nowhere more than in its sense for nature is the eighteenth century different from the nineteenth; Moritz lived before that romantic revival which gathered winter's beauty as well as summer's into its arms. Work, too, the daily task, had no poetry in it for Reiser and so he fled from the real world to a world of his own imagining. Where Asmus Semper reconciled the two, Reiser develope the inner life only and that to an almost morbid degree.

But in spite of these differences, in spite of Reiser's self-torture and obsession by ethical and religious abstractions, the two books have much in common. The reflex of the similarity of the two characters is strongest in the striking coincidence of treatment which the two boys receive at the hands of their mates. Each is made the victim of the same juvenile cruelty and each reacts on this in much the same way. In each case the tragedy is averted by sheer intellectual superiority and creative instinct.

The two boys have a like world of fantasy upon which to draw. Not only do the stage and its wonders play a part in each life, but the world of illusion is develope within them until it becomes almost all of their self. In this world all struggle, all pain, all toil are refined. They are reviewed in the light of a different inner sun and, directly and indirectly, are made to bear upon that miracle which each wrests from his own soul: his first poem. It is in each case the poet's progress that is told and in this fact lies the ultimate similarity of the two books.

GEORGE HENRY DANTON.

*Stanford University.*

---

#### THE ORDEAL OF HUBERT (*King John*, IV, iii).

The comparison of Shakespeare's own work with his originals is continuously suggestive. New light, I believe, is thrown upon the scene between Faulconbridge and Hubert in *King*

*John*, IV, iii and on a speech of Faulconbridge in the following scene (V, i, 43) by noting deviations from *The Troublesome Raigne of King Iohn* made by Shakespeare in apparently minor details. The hitherto unsuspected significance which I shall attempt to bring out is corroborated by the scene in *Richard III* (I, ii) where Gloucester meets the funeral procession of King Henry.

For the scene of Arthur's death and the finding of his body which forms the beginning of the second part of *The Troublesome Raigne*, the author or authors of the chronicle play found in Holinshed only the starting-point:

"But now touching the maner in verie deed of the end of Arthur, writers make sundrie reports. Neuerthelesse certeine it is, that, in the yeare next insuing, he was remooued from Falais vnto the castell or tower of Rouen, out of the which there was not any that would confesse that euer he saw him go aliue. Some haue written, that, as he assaied to haue escaped out of prison, and proouing to clime ouer the walls of the castell, he fell into the riuer of Saine, and so was drowned. Other write, that through verie gréepe and languor he pined awaie, and died of naturall sicknesse. But some affirme, that King John secretlie caused him to be murthered and made awaie, so as it is not throughlie agréed vpon, in what sort he finished his daies: but verelie king John was had in great suspicion, whether worthilie or not, the lord knoweth."<sup>1</sup>

Here, then, we have simply the bare facts of Arthur's removal to Rouen and of his subsequent disappearance, with the various rumors that were current as to the cause of his death. All is indefinite and impersonal: Arthur disappears, John is suspected of his murder. It was for the author, or authors, of *The Troublesome Raigne* to translate these vague data into speech and action, into concrete reality.

Of the three modes of death suggested, they chose the first, modifying it, for practical reasons, by having Arthur fall to the ground rather than into the Seine. The body is discovered by Pembroke, who is in the company

of Salisbury and Essex. The suspicion of John's guilt is shared by all three, but is expressed most pointedly by Salisbury. Hubert is accused of being the instrument of death. Later the true story is told by the Bastard.

The details of this episode, as dramatized in *The Troublesome Raigne*, are as follows:<sup>2</sup>

The second part begins with, "Enter yong Arthur on the walls." After eleven lines of soliloquy, "he leapes, and brusing his bones, after he was from his traunce, speakes thus." Fifteen lines follow, in which he commends his soul to Heaven and prays for his mother's happiness. Then he dies. "Enter Pembroke, Salsburie, Essex." From Essex's speech it appears that they hope, by corrupting the keepers, to find the grave of Arthur, whom they believe to be dead. Pembroke finds Arthur's body. Salisbury expresses his horror. Essex incites them to vengeance upon John.

At this moment "Hughbert" enters, to extend to them John's invitation to visit him. Arthur is in health in his custody. Essex points out to him the boy's lifeless body. Hubert protests his innocence, invoking God's curse upon himself if he did not leave Arthur alive. The only reply is Salisbury's, "Hence traitor hence, thy counesel is hereein." After the exit of Hubert, the three nobles resolve to invite the "Dolphin" to claim the kingdom. They plan their meeting, "the tenth of Aprill at Saint Edmunds Bury." After this, Essex says, "Then let vs all conuey the body hence."

It will be noted that the removal of the body of Arthur has no importance in this scene. It is not made to create any especial dramatic situation, but occurs, according to the wont of the Elizabethan drama, because the stage has to be cleared for the next scene.

The scene that follows is at John's court. Here Hubert is made to tell the king of the manner of Arthur's death.

Hard newes my Lord, Arthur the louely prince,  
Seeking to escape ouer the Castle walls,  
Fell headlong downe, and in the cursed fall  
He brake his bones, and there before the gate  
Your Barons found him dead, and breathlesse quite.

<sup>1</sup> Vol. II, p. 286 (ed. 1807).

<sup>2</sup> Hazlitt, *Shakespeare's Library*, Pt. II, vol. I, pp. 283-286, 287, 297.

Two scenes later, when the conspirators meet at Bury St. Edmund's, the Bastard enters and declares to them,

For Arthur's death, King Iohn was innocent,  
He desperat was the deathsman to himselfe,  
With [read which] you, to make a colour to your  
crime,  
Iniustly do impute to his default.

How Hubert has learned of Arthur's death, or of its circumstances, is not brought out.

When Shakespeare rewrote the old play, altering, abridging, expanding, cutting out entire scenes, recreating characters and dialogue, he did not spare these scenes. Some of the changes have been specifically pointed out in the annotated editions; all, of course, are open to discovery by any reader who will take the pains to compare the two versions. One change, however, apparently of no great consequence, but really, I suspect, of intense dramatic significance, has thus far escaped comment. This relates to the taking up of Arthur's body. In Shakespeare's play, this office is fulfilled, not by the nobles who discover it, but by Hubert, at the Bastard's command.

As in *The Troublesome Raigne*, Arthur leaps from the well (IV, iii) and dies. The three nobles (Bigot taking the place of Essex) enter, speaking of their purpose of meeting the Dauphin at Bury St. Edmund's. The Bastard (not Hubert) enters, and conveys John's request that they appear before him. While he is attempting to argue them out of their refusal, Salisbury discovers the body of Arthur. All express their horror; the nobles assuming without question that Arthur has been murdered, but the Bastard qualifying his remark by a condition:

It is a damned, and a bloody worke,  
The graceless action of a heauy hand,  
If that it be the worke of any hand.

To this Salisbury retorts,

It is the shamefull worke of *Huberts* hand,  
The practice, and the purpose of the king.

Pembroke and Bigot join with him in a vow of vengeance.

It is at this moment of passion that Hubert enters, repeating John's invitation, and assur-

ing all that Arthur still lives. Salisbury draws, and would take instant vengeance. Pembroke seconds him. But the Bastard, for the moment, takes Hubert's side, and the three lords depart, breathing defiance. Then follows a colloquy between the Bastard and Hubert in which it is clear that the Bastard at first regards Hubert as the possible murderer.

*Bast.* Beyond the infinite and boundlesse reach  
Of mercie (If thou didst this deed of death)

Art <sup>u</sup>Y damn'd *Hubert* . . . .

Thou art more deepe damn'd then Prince  
Lucifer;

There is not yet so vgly a fiend of hell  
As thou shalt be, if thou didst kill this childe.  
. . . . If thou didst but consent  
To this most cruell Act; do but dispair,  
And if thou want'st a Cord, the smallest thred  
That euer Spider twisted from her wombe  
Will serue to strangle thee . . . .  
I do suspect thee very greuously.

*Hub.* If I in act, consent, or sinne of thought,  
Be guiltie of the stealing that sweete breath  
Which was embodied in this beauteous clay,  
Let hell want paines enough to torture me.  
I left him well.

*Bast.* Go, beare him in thine armes.

In the following scene, when the Bastard bears to Hubert the news of the rising and of Arthur's death, John declares,

That villaine *Hubert* told me he did liue,

to which the Bastard replies,

So on my soule he did, for ought he knew.

What has caused the change in Faulconbridge's convictions? From suspecting Hubert grievously he has come to staking his soul on Hubert's innocence. Hubert, it is true, has sworn he is innocent, but is there no further reason?

Recall now the second scene of *Richard III*, Act I, where Anne beside the coffin of Henry VII and in the presence of Gloucester, cries out,

Oh Gentlemen, see, see dead *Henries* wounds,  
Open their congeal'd mouthes and bleed afresh.  
Blush, blush, thou lumpe of fowle Deformitie:  
For 'tis thy presence that exhales this blood  
From cold and empty Veines where no blood dwels,  
Thy Deeds inhumane and vnnaturall,  
Provokes this Deluge most vnnaturall.



The reason for the Bastard's assurance of Hubert's innocence is plain. Suspecting Hubert of the guilt of Arthur's death, he commands him,

Go, beare him in thine armes.

This is the ordeal of the suspected murderer. If the corpse bleed afresh, Hubert is guilty; if not, he is innocent. The ordeal satisfies Faulconbridge, and he is able to declare upon his soul that Hubert is blameless.

This superstition, that of the *cruentatio*, is conjectured to be of Celtic origin.<sup>3</sup> It first appears in literature in the *Chevalier du Lion* of Chrestien de Troyes (about 1173; ll. 1177-1200, ed. Foerster). That it was a familiar notion in Shakespeare's day appears not only from *Richard III*, but from Thomas Lupton's *Thousand Notable Things*, p. 255 (1579); *Arden of Feversham*, V, iii (1592); Copley's *Wits, Fits, and Fancies* (1595), reprinted in Hazlitt's *Popular Antiquities*, III, 209; Bastard's *Chrestoleros* v. 22 in *A Collection of Epigrams* (1598); and Chapman's *Widow's Tears*, V, i (1612). It appears in the ballad of *Young Hunting* (*Young Redin, Earl Richard*), Child, II, 146, 148, 153. Several allusions to the same belief occur in Dryden's plays (*Works*, Scott-Saintsbury, II, 183; III, 391; IV, 208). In the nineteenth century we find the same superstition made use of in Strutt's *Test of Guilt* (1808), in *The Fair Maid of Perth*, *The Marble Faun*, *Our Mutual Friend*, and *Tom Sawyer*.

It may be urged that the words of the Bastard, before and after the command to lift up the body, contain no explicit declaration that he is subjecting Hubert to this ordeal of blood-guiltiness. This objection is not fatal, for it is often the case with Shakespeare that "more is

meant than meets the ear." The absence of stage-directions is even less significant, for no edition of *King John* was included among the early quartos, in which the stage-directions are fullest. A glance at the text will show that the stage-directions are exceptionally meagre. Apart from "Whispers with Blanch" (after II, i, 503) and "King John brought in" (after V, vii, 27), there is not one which throws any light upon stage business, beyond what is obvious from the dialogue. Many things that one would find noted in any stage copy, such as the horn blown before Lady Faulconbridge appears (I, i, 217), and the lion's skin worn by Austria (II, i; III, i), are not set down. The lack of a stage-direction counts for nothing.

Another question may well be raised: in the absence of definite allusion in the dialogue, could the audience have seen in Hubert's lifting of the body any such significance as that here alleged? Certainly an audience of to-day would miss the point, but for an audience of Shakespeare's day, when the superstition was a matter of common belief, the difficulty ceases to exist. The anxiety of the Bastard as Hubert lifted the dead prince in his arms, his quick glance at Arthur's body, the instant change in his manner, would leave no chance for doubt.

One fatal objection remains to be answered: if this was once so clear, how has the tradition been lost? The history of the play solves this difficulty. So far as we know, the play was off the stage for something between ninety-five and one hundred and forty years. Between the mention by Meres in 1598 and the revival at Covent Garden in 1737, there is no record of the acting of *King John*. Very likely it was still acted for some years after 1598, but subject and style mark it as a play which probably soon went out of fashion. The absence of any mention of a revival at the Restoration, taken in connection with its anti-Roman Catholic vein, is practically conclusive evidence that no such revival took place. This complete break in the tradition is the reason why, in 1737, the meaning of the incident was no longer understood.

If the reader will accept this interpretation, as I hope that he will, he will see that what in the earlier play was the perfunctory re-

<sup>3</sup> See Child, *English and Scotch Popular Ballads*, II, 143; IV, 468, and the references there given. The fullest treatment of the subject is that by C. V. Christensen, *Baareproven*, Copenhagen, 1900, known to me only from reviews; an adequate summary is given in the *Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1901, no. 8. The literary illustrations cited above include some from this review, some given by editors of *Richard III*, and some noted by myself.

moval of a body to clear the stage, becomes in Shakespeare's hands a moving and dramatic incident, and he will see once more justified what De Quincey said of Shakespeare, that "the further we press in our discoveries, the more we shall see proofs of design and self-supporting arrangement, where the careless eye had seen nothing but accident."

W. STRUNK, JR.

Cornell University.

#### HERODIAS THE WILD HUNTRESS IN THE LEGEND OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

With regard to an article by Mr. Jacob N. Beam, concerning Herodias and Salome in modern literature, published in the January issue of the *Modern Language Notes*, I have a few remarks to offer. The writer expresses the opinion that the love element is entirely of nineteenth century romantic origin, and that the well known fertility and perversity of Heine's imagination makes it probable that he invented the saga pure and simple and assigned a fictitious source, as he had done before with the saga of the "Flying Dutchman" in *Die Memoiren des Herrn Schnablewopski*. In the famous chapter of *Atta Troll* where Herodias appears in company with other mythological ladies, Heine tells us that Herodias had John the Baptist beheaded on account of her unrequited love.

"In der Bibel steht es nicht,  
Doch im Volke lebt die Sage  
Von Herodias' blutiger Liebe."

Thus Heine indicates that his conception of Herodias is based on a popular legend. The vague term "im Volke" gives no clue whether we are referred to Jewish or Christian legends. It is, however, easy enough to show that Heine has not "invented the saga pure and simple" nor even any important feature of the same. I refer only to the chapters on the "Furious Host," on "Bertha," Abundia, Holda, the "witches jaunt," etc., in Jac. Grimm's *Teutonic Mythology*,

where abundant references to Herodias, the wind's bride are to be found. Although Heinrich Heine often enough ruthlessly scoffed at his most intimate object of hatred, Massmann:

"Nur altdeutsch verstand er, der Patriot,  
Nur Jacob Grimmisch und Zeunisch,"

there is ample evidence that he followed "blushingly" Jacob Grimm's footsteps.

After all Heine's satire had reference only to the exaggerations of some of Grimm's followers. Heine was throughout an ardent admirer of Jacob Grimm's almost superhuman work in the field of folklore. In "Elementargeister und Dämonen," published in 1834, he pays the following enthusiastic tribute to Jacob Grimm: "Der einzige Jacob Grimm hat für Sprachwissenschaft mehr geleistet als eine ganze französische Akademie seit Richelieu. Seine Deutsche Grammatik ist ein kolossales Werk, ein gothischer Dom, worin alle germanischen Völker ihre Stimmen erheben, jedes in seinem Dialekte. Jacob Grimm hat vielleicht dem Teufel seine Seele verschrieben, damit er ihm Materialien lieferte und ihm als Handlanger diene bei diesem ungeheuren Sprachbauwerke. In der That, um diese Quadern von Gelehrsamkeit herbeizuschleppen, um aus diesen hunderttausend Citaten einen Mörtel zu stampfen, dazu gehört mehr als ein Menschenleben und mehr als Menschengeduld."

So it is no daring assumption that Heine may have studied these chapters very carefully; here the graceful, fairy Abundia, whom he has treated with such tenderness in the same chapter, may have smiled at the poet. Heinrich Heine took from his early youth a deep interest in all popular legends and mythology, and he remained true to this passion to the end of his life. This absorbing interest is splendidly attested by such works as *Elementargeister und Dämonen* (1834), *Die Götter im Exil* (1836) and *Dr. Faust, ein Tanzpoem, nebst kuriosesten Berichten über Teufel, Hexen und Dichtkunst* (1847). Making his preparations for these works, he undoubtedly had to read a good deal on occult sciences, magic, witchcraft and related subjects. Here he must have met Herodias the Wild Huntress almost at every step, for Herodias, as we shall see, was for several centuries a most important name, and although only a spectre, a dire reality. In like manner was His Hellish Majesty,

as whose emanation or incarnation Herodias was considered, for Heine a very fascinating personality. He mentions him often enough, for instance :

Mensch, verspötte nicht den Teufel,  
or  
Ich rief den Teufel und er kam, etc.

Modern psychologists speak of the mythological faculty of our dream-life. Heine would probably have taken the opposite point of view and have interpreted the formation of mythology as the dreaming of the "Volksseele." And just here we find the psychological explanation of Heine's strong affinity for everything mythological. "Traumbilder" were, we may say, the overture of his career as a lyric poet.

Another point of attraction for Heine in the subject of "Herodias" was the dance-element. Heine entertained throughout his life an exorbitant enthusiasm for the art of Terpsichore. Here I mention only his dithyrambs on "Pomare," the celebrated dancer. The poet becomes so excited over the grandiose performance that he imagines he is Herod and Pomare is Salome, and he winds up with the order, "Man schlage ab das Haupt dem Täufer" (to decapitate John the Baptist).

Sie tanzt. Derselbe Tanz ist das,  
Den einst die Tochter Herodias'  
Getanzt vor dem Judenkönig Herodes.  
Ihr Auge sprüht, wie Blitze des Todes.

Sie tanzt mich rasend—ich werde toll—  
Sprich Weib, was ich Dir schenken soll?  
Du lächelst! Heda! Trabanten, Läufer!  
Man schlage ab das Haupt dem Täufer!

Of the almost innumerable passages in mediæval literature, where Herodias is mentioned as the leader or one of the leaders of the "Furious Host," I shall mention only a few. The most famous of all is the so-called *Canon Episcopi* which has been considered a document of the highest authority on matters of witchcraft during the middle ages, nay even until the beginning of the seventeenth century. This Canon has been attributed to the council of Ancyra in 314; this of course is an unwarranted assumption; it is found, however, for the first time in the *Instruction for the visit of a diocese*, written by Regino who was abbot of Prüm until 899 and died at Treves in 915. It can hardly be doubted that this *Canon* dates at

least from the seventh century. This is however of no importance here, as I wish only to indicate the sources where Heine might have found at least traces or features of the Herodias legend. Jules Baisac in his interesting, but by no means exhaustive *Histoire de la Diablerie Chrétienne; Le Diable, la personne du diable, le Personnel du diable* (Paris, 1882), quotes, p. 275, the Canon in full; in Grimm's *Mythology* the Canon is quoted in abridged form. The Canon reads as follows:

"There are some criminal women who, seduced by the illusions and phantoms of the Devil, have placed themselves under the yoke of Satan; and they believe and assert that during the night they ride and roam with Diana, Goddess of the Heathens, or with Herodias and an innumerable crowd of other women, astride on certain animals, and that they traverse great distances in the silence of darkness; they claim that they do homage to this Goddess acknowledging her for their sovereign; and that they are sometimes called on for personal service. The priests shall in the churches entrusted to their care employ great diligence to instruct the people and to teach them that all this is false, that they are the victims of pure phantasms sent into the souls of the unbelievers, not by the divine spirit, but by the Evil One. For Satan, who transfigures himself into an angel of light, having become Lord and master of the soul of a poor woman on account of her infidelity and lack of faith, takes unto himself the form and the appearances of different persons. In this manner he mocks the poor soul during sleep, holding it in captivity and presenting to such soul visions, sometimes triste, sometimes gay, of things known and unknown, leading such poor soul astray from the straight path. All this takes place only in the mind, but the unbelieving soul is firmly convinced that it is real.

"Who has not seen in his sleep many things which he never saw while awake! And who is ignorant and silly enough to believe that all which takes place in the mind has likewise an external reality? For instance, when Ezechiel had the visions of the Lord, it was in his mind, not in the body, and when the apostle John was enraptured in ecstasy, was it in the mind or in the body? It devolves on us to declare publicly that whoever believes such things and others of the same kind,

has lost his faith, and who has lost faith in the Lord, does not belong to the Lord but to him in whom he believes, that is *the Devil*. Whosoever then believes that anything can be created, or that any creature can be changed into a better or worse form, except by the Creator himself: such person, we declare, is beyond doubt, an infidel and worse than a pagan."

I have given the admonition of the *Canon Episcopi* in extenso, for the following reason: Paul Hoensbroeck in his work *Das Papsttum in seiner social-kulturellen Wirksamkeit* refers to the admonition, wherein the imaginary character of the nightly witch-jaunt is asserted, as "pronouncing a verdict of condemnation on the horrible bulls and blood-curdling manifestations of the vicegerents of Christ in later centuries; on the other hand, all the greatest promoters of the incineration of witches loudly protest against such impious interpretation, and they appeal, as it were, unanimously 'a Canone Episcopi male interpretato ad Canonem melius interpretandum.'" If we appreciate the spiritualistic character of the conception of the world in the middle ages, we cannot, I think, fail to conclude that the question whether these roamings are to be conceived in realistic terms, or as taking place only in the imagination of the adherents of the devil, and at the same time of the spectators, is entirely secondary. The "maleficium" consists in the pact with the devil and the submission to his sovereignty. This, of course, is easily explained on a purely spiritualistic basis. The pact with the devil may be implicit, i. e., consist in merely passive submission to his power.

But in order to set our doubts at rest, let us turn for enlightenment to the highest, most irrefragable authority on such matters, the *Malleus Maleficarum*, the Witch-Hammer of the Dominican fathers Sprenger and Institoris, which in the year of the Lord 1484 made its appearance with the approbation of the University of Cologne and proving its right of existence by prefixing the execrable witch-bull of Innocens VIII, "Summis desiderantes." For later editions the reverend authors succeeded in securing a diploma of Emperor Maximilian. Supported by this formidable array of authority, both spiritual and secular, these blood-thirsty fanatics deliver the evangel of the persecu-

tion of witches, as it were, ex cathedra. They lay especial stress on the following points:

Every preacher, therefore, ought to inculcate the following four important points:

- 1) Besides God there is no other divine Being.
- 2) When the witches boast of their nightly roamings in the suite of Diana and Herodias, they are in fact, enjoying the company of the devil.
- 3) *This happens in the imagination only*, the devil operating on the soul in such manner that the witch imagines to ride through the air, while she remains at home.
- 4) That wizards and witches obey the devil in all things.

We cannot expect consistency of fanatics of the class of Sprenger and Institoris; often enough the *Malleus Maleficarum* speaks of the nightly excursions in a thoroughly realistic fashion.

Nearly all the promoters of the persecution of witches express their cordial agreement with the *Canon Episcopi*, for instance Spina; and they protest energetically against an interpretation that would attempt to explain away the crime of witchcraft. I believe, their point is well taken. The canon contains all the most ardent "crushers of witches" may desire. Mark well the expression, "they belong to him in whom they believe, that is the Devil." Can this mean anything else than what the *Witch-Hammer* calls "the implicit pact with the Devil?" Furthermore, do the terms "infidelity," "lack of faith," "worse than pagans," imply the crime of apostasy and heresy which in the eyes of mediæval theologians was a crime deserving capital punishment. The quotation of isolated passages from a document or author is more or less misleading; the danger is the greater the more the spirit of those times "is removed from" the spirit of our time. Goethe compared "past times" to a book with seven seals, and warns us not to introject our ideas into our interpretation of other ages. It would be, in my opinion, not particularly difficult to make up a fairly substantial collection of dicta from the writings of the most notorious obscurantists, which will make them appear in the light of high-minded, unprejudiced, humanitarian gentlemen.

I cannot leave the *Canon Episcopi* without adding a few remarks concerning the mythological implications of this important document. We



find here Herodias associated with Diana, but not in the same sense as in Heine's *Atta Troll*. For Herodias and Diana in the Canon *Episcopi* are not to be interpreted as two distinct personalities. They are only two "avatars" of the Evil One, who now takes unto himself the form of Diana, now of Herodias, now combining attributes of both in one apparition. We have here the dream-like suspension of the bonds of identity, so beautifully illustrated in Gerhard Hauptmann's *Hanneles Himmelfahrt*, where the personality of her beloved teacher and that of the Saviour flow together in the apparition of "the Stranger." Diana was well known to the clergy as an incarnation of the Evil One from the New Testament story of the Diana of the Ephesians. The Canon *Episcopi* gives us no information concerning the question whether Herodias the Wild Huntress and leader of the "Furious Host" is understood to be the wife of King Herod whose malice brought about the doom of John the Baptist, or her daughter Salome. Origen tells us that the maiden who danced before the king and to whom the head of the Baptist was given in a golden charger was also known as "Herodias." It is well known that in Hellenistic literature patronymics were employed in a very loose way. So the damsel in question would even as a step-daughter of Herod have been entitled to the name of "Herodias." Moreover, we know she was the daughter of Herodes Philippus. And thus her claim to be called "Herodias" cannot be disputed.

Furthermore, it is one of the fundamental characteristics of mythological evolution, that functions, originally attributed to the father are at a later stage of the saga attributed to the son, and those of the mother to the daughter and vice versa. It is easy to follow up this development in classical as well as in Germanic mythology. The somewhat trivial principle: "No difference, that remains in the family," is everywhere in evidence. In the legend which now concerns our attention, it requires no further argument to show that mother and daughter have continuously exchanged places. Nay, we should have no right to be surprised if we were to meet Herod the Wild Hunter instead of Herodias the Wild Huntress. I have not put myself to any trouble in order to "nail" Herod the Wild Hunter. Fr. Perreaud,

who in the year of the Lord 1653 published his *Demonologie* or *Traité des démons et sorciers*, tells us on page 126: "I have learned from very trustworthy persons that at different times of the night, especially about Christmas time, such a terrible ferocious noise was heard in the air that you would have said: all the dogs of the country are barking to their heart's content; the people generally claim that this is King Herod leading the Furious Host and that he is condemned to this exercise; but the more enlightened are of opinion that it is the Devil himself who makes this noise in order to disturb the people in their devotion." Here we have enlightenment, as Fr. Perreaud understood it. In this case, of course, it is Herod who killed the innocents, whom the people credited with this tremendous noise-making faculty. But after all to the mythological fancy of the people "all Herods will look alike," and we may anticipate to meet a King Herod as leader of the Furious Host who will be an amalgamation of the two Herods.

WALDEMAR KLOSS.

Cambridge, Mass.

#### ROBINSON CRUSOE'S ISLAND.

The location of Robinson Crusoe's island having come up as a question, a well known cyclopedia of names was consulted as an authority that could be cited. Under Robinson Crusoe and under Selkirk there was something about Crusoe, but nothing about his island.

William A. Wheeler's *Explanatory and Pronouncing Dictionary of the Noted Names of Fiction*, 17th ed. (Boston 1882), was next examined, and under *Crusoe*, Robinson, was this:

"The hero of DeFoe's great novel; a shipwrecked sailor who for many years leads a solitary existence on an uninhabited island of the tropics, and who alleviates his long reclusion by an inexhaustible prodigality of contrivance."

Mr. Wheeler's "Names" were contributed by him to one of our best known dictionaries of the English language. In the volumes dated 1890, 1901 and 1907, the names and explanations are

printed as revised by another hand. Two words only are changed in what is said of Robinson Crusoe; "in the Pacific" is substituted for "of the tropics,"—an unfortunate substitution, for *Pacific* is not more precise here than *tropics*, and is a departure from the place stated by Crusoe.

But Professor Beers, the reviser, was not alone in thinking that Crusoe's island was in the Pacific. The gazetteer that follows the "Noted Names" in the same copies of this dictionary (1890, 1901, 1907) calls Juan Fernandez "Robinson Crusoe's Island," and I recall among recollections of my childhood that Juan Fernandez and Robinson Crusoe's island were often spoken of at school and elsewhere as being the same. I did not read Crusoe's adventures till I was nine or ten years old, and then I noticed in the narrative that the island where he was wrecked was not in the Pacific, but on the other side of the continent near the northern coast of South America. Since then I have seen in public prints and heard in talk many references to Juan Fernandez or "Selkirk's Island" as being Crusoe's island. It is to be regretted that this error has received a stamp of authority; for among us Americans (except for a few), the family dictionary, of whatever name, ranks with the family Bible.

If we consult Crusoe's story we find that he was a planter in the Brasils, at the time he embarked for the coast of Guinea; that he went as supercargo to buy negroes for himself and other planters; and that after crossing the equator, while sailing in a northerly direction, the ship was struck by a hurricane which drove her for twelve days.

"About the twelfth day," says Crusoe, "the weather abating a little the master took an observation as well as he could and found . . . he was got upon the coast of Guiana, or the north part of Brazil, beyond the river Amazons, toward that of the River Oroonoke, commonly called the Great River. . . . Looking over the charts of the sea-coast of America with him, we concluded there was no inhabited country for us to have recourse to [for repairs] till we came within the circle of the Caribbee islands, and therefore resolved to stand away for Barbadoes."

But when in latitude twelve degrees and eighteen minutes, another furious storm drove them westward, land was sighted, the ship struck sand, and the sea broke over her. All on board ex-

pected the ship to go to pieces immediately; the boat which they got into was swamped and upset by "a raging wave, mountain-like," and Crusoe was the only one who got ashore. His explorations later showed that he was on an uninhabited island.

It is plain from the foregoing account that this island could not possibly have been in the Pacific Ocean.

Crusoe had seen on clear days from a hill on his island land that he thought was the continent, but which he found later was islands near the mouth of the Oroonoke. While contriving means for going to the mainland, which he supposed these islands to be, Crusoe and his man Friday rescued Friday's father and a Spaniard from a party of savages who had brought them to Crusoe's island for a meal, and Crusoe learned from the Spaniard that there were Spaniards and Portuguese on Crusoe's supposed mainland who had been wrecked there in "a Spanish ship bound from the Rio de la Plata to the Havana."

The statements and quotations given above as to the course of the ship in which Crusoe was supercargo agree with an American reprint of *Robinson Crusoe*. They have been verified by comparing them with the fourth edition of the first volume (London, 1719), and with the map in the fourth edition showing the ship's course.

If the title-page of the first volume of *Robinson Crusoe*, as published in the early editions, had been uniformly retained in all reprints, the idea that Crusoe's island was in the Pacific could never have taken root. The title-page of the fourth edition of the first volume is transcribed below.

"The Life and Strange Surprising Adventures of Robinson Crusoe, of York, Mariner: Who lived Eight and Twenty Years all alone in an uninhabited Island on the Coast of America, near the Mouth of the Great River of Oroonoke; Having been cast on Shore by Shipwreck, wherein all the Men perished but himself. With An Account how he was at last as strangely deliver'd by Pyrates.—Written by Himself.—The Fourth Edition.—To which is added a Map of the World, in which is Delineated the Voyages of Robinson Crusoe.—London: Printed by W. Taylor at the Ship in Pater-Noster-Row.—1719."

This title-page is the same as the title-page of the first edition of the first volume in Elliot Stock's facsimile reprint of *Robinson Crusoe*, ex-

cept in having *Fourth Edition* and what is said of the map.

The first edition of the first volume was published April 25, 1719, and the fourth edition of the same volume August 8 of the same year, according to the *Dictionary of National Biography*, vol. 14, p. 288.

With reprints scattered through the country in which the title-pages said nothing of the place where Crusoe was wrecked, a false idea of the place might easily grow up in the United States if there was any strong influence tending to start and foster a false idea about it. An influence of that kind has been abroad ever since writers associated Crusoe with Selkirk. Selkirk's solitary life on Juan Fernandez is matter of history, and it has long been customary to speak of Selkirk as the original of Defoe's Crusoe. Naturally a sincere lover of Defoe's great masterpiece is inclined to resent an imputation that seems to derogate from the genius of its maker; but if there are any great masterpieces which are so wholly original that their inception did not come from an outside source, I do not know what and where those masterpieces are.

Selkirk's account of himself in *The Englishman*, Numb. xxvi (December 1-3, 1713), taken from his lips about five and a half years before Robinson Crusoe appeared, and what Selkirk said of his life on Juan Fernandez, as reported by Captain Woodes Rogers (1712), made him a public character who could hardly have been overlooked by such a man as Defoe, and certainly the details of these accounts suggest that he was Crusoe's original. Though Selkirk was not the only recluse who has been named for that high distinction, it is reasonable to believe that Defoe meditated on the possibilities of such a life as Selkirk's until *Robinson Crusoe* was achieved.

The only parts of Captain Rogers' *Journal* that I have seen were incomplete reprints. Number xxvi of *The Englishman*,—an original copy,—is in the Yale Library.

RALPH OLMSTED WILLIAMS.

New Haven, Conn.

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

*The Development of Standard English Speech in Outline.* By J. M. HART. Pp. vii, 93. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1907.

Notwithstanding the larger treatises covering the subject, there was room for this little book, and the making of it has fallen into good hands. Professor Hart has an enviable reputation as an expert in English linguistics, and besides has the gift of clear and succinct expression. This gift is illustrated by the opening paragraph of his General Remarks, which also suggests the scope of the book:

'The history of the growth of modern English pronunciation is complicated. Certain features are puzzling; some are obscure and—even in the best light of our present knowledge—appear arbitrary. The chief features, however, admit of systematic explanation and can be mastered by all who will take the pains.'

The trenchant unconventionality which here and there appears will be refreshing to many readers. Here is a specimen (pp. v, vi):

'Next, in nearly all phonological discussions there is too much Ormulum; the work of Brother Orm is viewed as if it were the norm of twelfth-century speech. This is to overlook the patent fact that it represented only one small district. Lastly, I am more than puzzled by the air of confidence with which the German school block<sub>s</sub> out mediæval England in squares like a checker-board and assigns each bit of writing, from Layamon's Brut to the "Alliterative Poems," to its particular little square. I must confess to being deplorably deficient in this sense of the fourth dimension.'

Perhaps mathematical, no less than non-mathematical readers, will be 'more than puzzled' by this 'fourth dimension,' but the vigor of the writing will not be questioned.

The little book, which, according to its author, 'may be said to represent Cornell aim and method,' is well conceived, and, in the main, well executed. The strictures which it occurs to me to pass are few and comparatively slight, and are such as could easily be turned to account in a second edition, if it seemed to the author worth while.

In illustrating the interchange of *i* and *e* in ME., Professor Hart says (p. 34): 'In the *Ayenbite* (fourteenth century) the Mn. E. word *sin* is written *zenne* (initial *z* for *s* is Southern dialect).' Is not this to overlook the fact that the *Ayenbite* is the most typical representative of the Kentish dialect (Morsbach, *Mitteleng. Gram.*, p. 10), and that in this dialect OE. *y* (not *i*) regularly becomes *e* (Morsbach, pp. 164, 176)? In fact, *e* for *y* is a Kentish peculiarity in Old English itself (Sievers, § 154).

On p. 40 we seem to be told that Mod. Eng. *taught* comes from OE. *tāhte* through ME. *tā(u)hte*; in other words, that OE. *āht* becomes *āht* in ME. Is not this to overlook the fact that *tāhte* occurred in OE., along with *tāhte* (Sievers, § 407, note 11), and that ME. *tāhte* is usually explained as a shortening of the OE. form (Morsbach, p. 136)?

In commenting (pp. 13, 22) on the length of the vowel in OE. *dēofol*, ME. (Orm) *deofless*, *defless*, and its shortness in Mod. Eng. (or 'Mn. E.', if any one prefers), Professor Hart ignores the Scotch and Northern English *deevil*, *deil*.

Professor Hart says (p. vii): '*G. T.* (General Teutonic) is a safer abbreviation than *Germ.* (Germanic), which might be mistaken for German.' But this would not apply to *Gmc.*, for which there is sufficient precedent. He properly employs the term 'Old English,' instead of 'Anglo-Saxon'; but why not 'OE.' (see *NED.*), instead of 'O. E.?' 'Umlauted' (p. 6), 'i-umlaut' (p. 69), ought to be generally approved. 'Diphthonging,' though an unlovely word, is not without authority, and is here commonly employed; but why then also 'diphthongization' (twice on p. 3)? 'In open syllable' (p. 32) may be justified as technical phraseology, but I should have preferred the insertion of 'an.'

Is Professor Hart a spelling reformer, or not? He writes 'rimes' (p. 12), but 'levelling' (p. 22, and elsewhere).

On p. 25 occurs 'designate it with the sign *ē*'; usage seems to be in favor of 'by.'

For the sound of *j* in *joke* the author employs *df*, as 'the usual sign might be confounded with an O. E. *dz* (p. vii).' This seems hardly likely, and, in any case, *dzh* might have been employed, in spite of its inconsistency with *tf*, rather than

to employ a symbol which, strictly regarded, is incorrect.

In general, Professor Hart seems to prefer to express the long diphthongs, *ēa*, *ēo*, *īe*, by extending the macron over both vowel-signs (see particularly p. 67, bottom, and cf. p. 42, bottom); but several exceptions occur: *brēost* (p. 17); *dēor* (p. 19); *stēop* (p. 25); *ēoh*, *ðēoh* (p. 40); *dēaf* (p. 41). With regard to *seēawian*, *ēow*, *enēow* (p. 42), I am in doubt, though probably the macron is meant for only the first vowel-sign. See also *heah*, without the macron (p. 40); *Eād-mund* (p. 14). Such discrepancies would be likely to puzzle a beginner; their occurrence is the more surprising because of the statement (p. iii): 'In preparing the manuscript for publication and in reading proof I have got much help of every sort from Assistant Professor C. S. Northup and Dr. B. S. Monroe.'

Before leaving the matter of proof-reading, I may be permitted to refer to the difficult matter of securing consistency in the hyphenation of compounds. Here, for example, we have 'vowel-lengthening' (p. 6) and 'vowel-shortening' (p. 13), 'vowel-quality' (p. 33), 'stop-*g*' (p. 75), but 'vowel quantity' (p. 10), 'vowel quality' (p. 22), 'vowel changes' (p. 45), 'vowel crasis' (p. 12), 'stop *g*' (p. 74). So 'noun-suffix' (p. 20), but 'adjective suffix' (p. 21). Other questionable forms are: 'Consonant groups' (p. 6), 'consonant changes' (p. 49), 'consonant system' (p. 49), 'consonant combinations' (p. 15), 'stem vowels' (p. 20), 'stem syllable' (p. 6), 'dialect form(s)' (pp. 7, 23); cf. 'rime-couplet' (p. 12), 'word-couplets' (p. 51), '*ch*, *j* sound' (p. 53). Since the publication of the *Standard Dictionary*, and Mr. F. H. Teall's work on this subject, greater consistency in the hyphenation of words is more practicable.

The punctuation leaves something less, if not something more, to be desired. In such tables as that on p. 14, one hardly sees the use of the periods (cf. pp. 11, 46, where they prove quite unnecessary). On p. 74, in the headings '1).', etc., either the ) or the period is superfluous, and the preceding paragraph might end with a colon (so pp. 42, 43, 45, 64). On p. 16, more numerals seem necessary after 2, if each consonant-combination is to be separately treated.



Perhaps the 'guttural' of 'guttural vowels' (p. 64) needs a word of explanation. The *-ly* of p. 63 ought hardly to be derived from OE. *-lic*, *-lice*, without a reference to Old Norse influence.

All due allowance being made for these trifles, the value of the book is not seriously impaired by them. They are easily corrected, and the student will not be led seriously astray by a failure to correct them. The book ought to be of real service in diffusing sound knowledge of the relation of modern English pronunciation to that of our earlier speech. It should be welcome alike where more voluminous books dealing with the subject have penetrated, and where they have not. Its value is materially increased by the index of words, covering 15 pages.

ALBERT S. COOK.

Yale University.

---

*Hernani* par VICTOR HUGO, with Introduction, Notes, and Vocabulary by JAMES D. BRUNER, PH. D., Associate Professor of the Romance Languages in the University of North Carolina. New York: American Book Co., 1906. 12mo., cloth, pp. 264, price 60c.

Two English editions and four American editions of Victor Hugo's *Hernani* attest the popularity of this standard play for school purposes. This verdict is amply justified by reasons that are, each alone, wellnigh quite sufficient to warrant an edition of the masterpiece. The intensely interesting human nature of the piece, its artistic literary construction, its exemplification of the principles of the Romantic school, the straightforward style and freedom from unusual difficulties of expression, the high rank of the play itself as well as that of the author, each in itself, but especially all collectively justify the numerous editions the play is likely to have long into the future.

The first edition annotated for school purposes in America appears to be that of Miss Rena Michaels (Holt & Co., 1886). This edition is noted in the first number of *M. L. N.*, 1886, p. 27, col. 54. Its principal claim to school recognition in those early days of the rise of the study of modern languages was its availability. The

need of a school text more adequate in every respect was plainly felt; for two good school editions, both copyrighted in 1891, appeared, the first edited by Prof. J. E. Matzke (Heath & Co.), the second by Prof. G. M. Harper. To what an extent, then, Prof. Bruner's edition fills a lacuna depends upon the teacher's idea of what a text-book should be, or upon what a teacher most desires to find emphasized in a school edition.

As the English editions, the Hachette, edited by Gustave Masson, and reprinted in this country by Jenkins, New York, and the Rivington, edited by Mr. H. A. Perry, appeared before the American editions, the task of annotation ought now to be reduced to the minimum of difficulty. Indeed, Prof. Harper, the editor of the Holt edition, acknowledges this fact in his Preface, saying: "It would be unfair to Dr. Matzke in particular not to pay tribute to the completeness of his notes which leave his successor little chance for originality." Incidentally this simplifies the task of the reviewer, for the statement may be conscientiously made once for all that the four American editions, including the Scott Foresman edition which appeared in 1900, edited by Prof. J. R. Effinger, Jr., as regards the text are adequately and even thoroughly annotated.

Prof. Bruner's edition is the only one which has a vocabulary. The text-book forming one of a series, the vocabulary is made in accordance with the system of the American Book Co., which is to relegate to the vocabulary difficulties of idiom, explaining peculiarities of construction in the notes, paraphrasing, but as a rule, not giving any translations. While this method, on the one hand, puts a check upon offering too many translations, on the other, it prevents oftentimes giving just what a note should give and which properly can hardly be put into the vocabulary. A play like *Hernani* is apt to be better adapted to third year students than to those who have had less experience with the language. For third year students a vocabulary in general is a luxury, not a necessity. In Prof. Bruner's edition most of the lexical difficulties, some of which in the other editions may be considered worthy of a note, are made clear in the vocabulary. This leaves the field free for the editor to make the notes serve his particular purpose. In the present case, this pur-

pose is first and foremost to reveal the artistic and literary merit of the play. Prof. Bruner has made the best possible use of his opportunity. The notes are placed, most conveniently for the editor's purpose, at the bottom of the page, enabling the student to take advantage of them at once without interrupting the connection, in fact, rather reinforcing the author's own idea. Taken together with the thirty pages of introduction, they form a lucid and suggestive interpretation, from the literary and artistic standpoint, of the characters and episodes throughout the rather complicated plot of the play.

The Introductions contained in all four of the American editions are quite complete. Prof. Matzke's is the shortest, 19 pages; Prof. Bruner's contains 30; Prof. Effinger's 34, and Prof. Harper's 42. All four editors discuss pretty fully what may be called: The origin of the Romantic drama. The Matzke and Bruner editions then follow along more closely than do the other editions the same general lines. The two former give due attention to the versification, language, first performance, plot, and the characters. The salient difference between the two editions is that each editor elaborates what to him appears particularly worthy of so doing. Thus Prof. Matzke goes farther into the subject of versification than any of the other editors, and then refers the specialist for further details to his article in *M. L. N.*, VI, p. 168, cols. 336-341. He also takes advantage of this same means of offering more detailed information in regard to the historical Hernani by referring the student to another of his articles on the last named topic in *M. L. N.*, VI, p. 37, cols. 74-82. Prof. Bruner treats more fully than do the other editors the plot and the characters. In the nature of the case, more or less of the information on each topic is repeated by each editor. For instance, the Matzke, Effinger, and Bruner editions illustrate a phase of versification, or language, by citing the historic verse 463 (not 416 as printed on p. xxv of the Matzke edition of 1891): Don Carlos. *Est-il minuit? Don Ricardo. Minuit bientôt.* Again, these three editions all relate the story about Mlle Mars and the celebrated verse 1028: *Vous êtes mon lion superbe et généreux!* Both the Matzke and Bruner editions deal directly with the subject in hand, the Matzke from an all-

round standpoint, the Bruner more especially from the literary and artistic. Evidently neither of these editors considers sufficiently germane for his purpose a sketch of Hugo's career. The Harper and Effinger introductions, on the contrary, contain quite a detailed account of Hugo's life and works. Moreover, the influence of the foreign drama, particularly that of Shakespeare and Schiller upon Hugo's work is dwelt upon at considerable length in the Harper and Effinger introductions. In the Harper edition, neither the plot of the play, the characters, the language, nor the first performance receive attention. The first performance, it is true, is merely touched upon, or rather alluded to: pp. xviii-xix. In place of calling attention to the plot, versification, etc., the editor gives a detailed account of the lives of Chateaubriand, Lamartine, and Lamennais: pp. xi-xiv. Considerable attention is given to De Musset, De Vigny, Balzac, George Sand, Dumas, and Sainte-Beuve: pp. xxvi-xxxi. A historical note: pp. xliii-xlvii, treating of the kings, queens, popes, cardinals, and electors from the time of the crowning of Charlemagne in 800 to the death of Charles V in 1558, takes the place of more pertinent comment bearing directly upon the subject in hand. Moreover, this entire Introduction, as relates to the editor himself or rather to his individual impressions, is written much more from the subjective standpoint than any one of the other three introductions. In proportion as it is less objective, in just about that degree does it fail to carry weight.

As regards the giving of a detailed personal sketch of an author as is usually done in text introductions, the appropriateness of so doing depends upon circumstances. In the case of an author so well known as Hugo, in view of the fact that the essential data are readily accessible in almost any biographical dictionary, their presentation in a text of this kind for students of French literature, may quite naturally be dispensed with. Unquestionably, the life of an author has oftentimes a predominating influence upon his work, as Prof. Harper clearly points out in the case of Hugo. How germane this may be to the subject presented for student reading is a question which each editor will decide for himself. In regard to the lives of other contemporary

authors whose influence makes itself more or less directly felt, it may be doubted whether detailed biographical information be sufficiently relevant to warrant its appearance in the introduction to a text for schoolroom purposes.

In brief, the comparison here instituted between the methods used by four editors, each of whom writes an introduction to the same text, well exemplifies the theme here discussed, the editor's point of view, its variety, and the cause of it. Whether a text is mainly for the study of the language, the literature, the history, the philology, phonetics, the versification, the translation, or something else, is apt to be reflected in the editor's treatment of the subject. As in education in general, the important question is: What is most worth while? For obvious reasons, there will continue to be as many different answers as there are editors.

The particular merit of Prof. Bruner's edition is its luminous and comprehensive treatment from the artistic and literary standpoint of the complicated plot and the many interesting situations of the play *Hernani*. The main subject of the drama, love, once indicated, the subordinate phases, jealousy, hatred with its consequent desire for revenge, manifest themselves in turn. The melodramatic atmosphere is constantly indicated by noting the allusions to secret doors, stairways, disguises, scenery, costumes, the antitheses, and particularly the grotesque. The melancholy of *Hernani*, the man of destiny, the fatal man, who lives *dans l'ombre*, his uncertainty and irresolution is effectively contrasted with Doña Sol's radiance, constancy, and singleness of purpose. The lighter, subordinate, more a comedy part, of Don Carlos is likewise skilfully exposed, as is also the marked quality of Castilian honor embodied in the character of Ruy Gomez. The comedy-like beginning and tragic-like ending of each act, together with the explanation of the ground for a fifth act are all presented cleverly and forcefully. Indeed, so well has Prof. Bruner done his work that he may perhaps be criticized for failing to leave to the student imagination anything to feed on.

It must be plain that such a thorough literary study of the play as it has received at the hands of Prof. Bruner renders this text of particular use

to teachers, more so even than to students. The ordinary difficulties found in the text being consigned, as previously explained, to the vocabulary, the Notes are simply complementary and supplementary to the literary Introduction. To appreciate them fully, a far more extensive knowledge of certain phases of the Greek, English, German, and French drama, not to mention the Latin, Italian, and Spanish, than is possessed by the average student, for whom the text primarily is intended, is necessary. For instance, a rapid examination of the notes alone reveals the fact that not less than twenty different plays of Shakespeare, besides the *Sonnets*, are cited in order to bring out comparisons between some Shakespearean scene and that in the play. Naturally the comparisons most frequently made are with scenes taken from the better known plays of Shakespeare. *Romeo and Juliet* is referred to at least eleven times; so, too, repeatedly, scenes from *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, *King Lear*, *Othello*, and the *Merchant of Venice*. The works of other English authors more or less frequently cited are those of Scott, Sheridan, Beaumont and Fletcher, Marlowe, Ben Jonson, Byron, and Tennyson. Scenes from the tragedies of Euripides, Æschylus, and Sophocles are constantly brought to mind. Scenes from no less than eight of Racine's plays, five of Corneille, several from *Mérope* and *Zaïre* of Voltaire and from the works of a number of Hugo's contemporaries, are recalled in rapid succession. Hugo's own plays (*Ruy Blas*, no less than fifteen times), naturally, are made the basis of numerous comparisons. Scenes from Schiller's plays figure at least twelve times. The allusions to works in Latin, Spanish, and Italian are less numerous. Perhaps some little idea of the frequency with which the editor reënforces his exposition of the dramatic situations by comparison with scenes taken from world literature may be got on p. 51, where in a note of twenty lines references to literary masterpieces occur as follows: three French, one English, two Greek, one Italian.

It now becomes obvious that such a commentary furnishes in itself material for study in no small measure. It might be well, therefore, in order to facilitate the task of the student particularly interested in the study of comparative literature, to

have the entire literary apparatus in both Introduction and Notes carefully indexed. Moreover, in order to save time in making comparisons, it is desirable to have the number of the act and scene printed at the top of the right hand page throughout the play, as in the Heath and Holt editions. Prof. Bruner has evidently made use of the same edition in establishing his text of the play as have the other American editors, that is the *ne varietur*, published by the firm Hetzel-Quantin, Paris, although there appears to be no indication of the fact in the text-book.

The following unimportant inaccuracies, either slips or typographical inadvertencies, have been called to the reviewer's notice, some very kindly by the editor himself, who has already corrected quite a number of mistakes in the copies of the play which were electrotyped later than the copy at hand: p. 41, v. 1, *déjà-lui*, delete the hyphen; p. 43, note v. 16 ff., read 13 ff.; p. 44, note v. 20, *choisir d'un des deux choses*, read *d'une (choisir d'une chose ou d'une autre)*; p. 55, note v. 169, *Guipazcoa*, read *Guipuzcoa*; p. 74, v. 381, insert the omitted words: *de ta suite* after *ô roi!*; p. 92, note vv. 567-70, in the first line of the poetry quoted: *je vous déthrône*, read *je vous détrône*; p. 108, note v. 751, read 753; p. 120, v. 892, insert the omitted last half: *Oh! pas même un couteau!*; p. 126, note in the line just above v. 1003: *Jagues*, read *Jacques*; p. 134, v. 1106, *Livre-là*, read *Livre-la*; p. 141, top, second line of italics, *poète*, read *porte*; p. 162, note just above v. 1425, *Henry III et sa court*, read *cour*; p. 166, v. 1480, *C'est*, read *Ces*; p. 169, v. 1529, *le toscin*, read *le tocsin*; p. 220, v. 2047, insert *des* after *les aînés*; p. 251, under Lutzembourg, delete *in Alsace*; p. 252, under *moins de—que*, smaller, read *shorter*; p. 262, the word *tocsin* omitted; p. 263, the word *vassal* omitted; p. 264, under *voix*, note, read *vote*.

It is hoped that the fact that three creditable editions of *Hernani*, hitherto not reviewed in *M. L. N.*, receive some little attention in this notice of Prof. Bruner's welcome edition, may be accepted as an excuse for the undue length of the review.

J. GEDDES, JR.

Boston University.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### THE CLOAK EPISODE IN SPANISH.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—A propos of the cloak episode in Lope de Vega's *El Honrado Hermano*, recently discussed by Stiefel, Leite de Vasconcellos, and Buchanan (cf. *MLN.*, Nov., 1907), it is interesting to note that Calderon makes use of the same anecdote. In the play of *Judas Macabeo* (Hartzenbusch ed., Vol. I, *Bib. de Aut. Esp.*, p. 315), Jonatas, brother of Judas, is sent on an embassy to Lisías, ruler of Jerusalem. On being denied a seat he sits on his mantle, states his mission and leaves, saying that he is not accustomed to carry his chair with him. Lisías keeps the cloak, saying it will prove that Jonatas has fled.

GEORGE TYLER NORTHUP.

Princeton University.

### THE "UNCOUTH SWAIN" IN MILTON'S *Lycidas*.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—The explanation given by editors of the term *uncouth* in the line of *Lycidas* "Thus sang the uncouth swain to the oaks and rills" have been various and not very satisfactory. Masson and some others endeavor to explain it with the meaning of 'unknown' and suppose the poet to be thus referring to an *imaginary* shepherd. But as Milton undoubtedly means himself there is no *unknown* character. Webster's dictionary quotes the line under "uncouth" with the meaning of 'boorish, awkward,' a force certainly not intended here. The real explanation of the word is, I think, to be found in the classical source from which Milton drew so much of the language and imagery of the poem. In Vergil's *Eclogue*, III, 26, 27, we find

non tu in triviis, indocte, solebas

Stridenti miserum stipula disperdere carmen?

Milton translates the second line thus, "Their lean and flashy songs grate on their scannell pipes of wretched straw" and was surely thinking of the word *indocte* in the preceding line when he wrote "*uncouth swain*." The meaning therefore is 'untaught, unskilled,' and an analysis of the English word would give this meaning quite as easily as that of 'unknown.'

THOS. K. SIDEY.

Seattle, Wash.



## DRYDEN AND SHELLEY ON MILTON.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—In *Adonais*, the fourth stanza, Shelley says of Milton:

He went, unterrified,  
Into the gulf of death; but his clear Sprite  
Yet reigns o'er earth; the third among the sons of light.

Rossetti comments on the last clause as follows (*Adonais*, ed. W. M. Rossetti and A. O. Prickard, p. 103): 'At first sight this phrase might seem to mean "the third-greatest poet of the world": in which case one might suppose Homer and Shakespeare to be ranked as the first and second. But it may be regarded as tolerably clear that Shelley is here thinking only of *epic* poets; and that he ranges the epic poets according to a criterion of his own, which is thus expressed in his *Defence of Poetry* (written in the same year as *Adonais*, 1821): "Homer was the first and Dante the second epic poet; that is, the second poet the series of whose creations bore a defined and intelligible relation to the knowledge and sentiment and religion of the age in which he lived, and of the ages which followed it—developing itself in correspondence with their development. . . . Milton was the third epic poet."'

It would not have been amiss to add the well-known lines of Dryden which 'appeared under the engraving prefixed to Tonson's folio edition of the *Paradise Lost*' (Dryden, *Works*, ed. Scott and Saintsbury, 11. 162):

Three poets, in three distant ages born,  
Greece, Italy, and England did adorn.  
The first, in loftiness of thought surpassed;  
The next, in majesty; in both, the last.  
The force of nature could no further go;  
To make a third, she joined the former two.

'Mr. Malone,' says Scott, 'regards Dryden's hexastich as an amplification of Selvaggi's distich, addressed to Milton while at Rome'—

Græcia Mæonidem, jactet sibi Roma Maronem,  
Anglia Miltonum jactat utrique parem.

It is not unreasonable to suppose that Shelley was familiar with the inscription by Dryden. If so, his tacit substitution of Dante for Virgil is all the more significant.

LANE COOPER.

Cornell University.

## A NEW MANUSCRIPT OF CHAUCER'S

*Monkes Tale*.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—Trinity College Cambridge MS. R. 3. 19 is a heterogeneous mass of fifteenth century poetry, chiefly famous as being the source of most

of Stow's additions to Chaucer, in his 1561 collection. The manuscript has been often described, and the latest description accessible to all is in Dr. James' Catalogue of the MSS. of this library, vol. II. An additional note upon articles number 39 and 40 in his summary of contents there printed is however needed, since Dr. James did not identify these items, except under the MS. title 'Bochas.'

On folio 170b, a *prohenium* beginning

Worshipfull and dyserete that here present be  
I wyll yow tell a tale, two or thre,

is to be identified as the monk's opening speech, in the Oxford Chaucer, B 3157-3180. The first line as here given is the work of the person who made these extracts; the rest are all Chaucer's. The monk's speech is written as if composed in three stanzas of eight lines each, instead of in couplets. There follows the *Monkes Tale*, B 3181-3196 (De Lucifero). Then, because Chaucer had not done justice to Adam in his one poor stanza, the scribe substituted Lydgate's long account of Adam in the *Fall of Princes*, and certain envoys from the same source, in Bk. I, chaps. 1, 3, 4, 8 (in part). This brings us to folio 179a, where the scribe went back to the *Monkes Tale*, and completed it, from Sampson to Cresus, B 3205-3956. The order and contents are as given in the latest manuscripts, except that ll. 3565-3588 were omitted—on Pedro of Cyprus and Pedro of Spain—and l. 3611 was passed over by mistake, and the stanzas following that line confused thereby. Having completed the *Monkes Tale*, and added his *Explicit*, the scribe went on with extracts and envoys from the *Fall of Princes*, in the following order: Books I, chapters 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 18, 23; II, 2, 1, 6, 12, 13, 15, 21, 22, 25, 27, 30; III, 5, 9, 10, 14, 17, 20.

This performance is interesting, as exhibiting the taste which could select this tale of all others for reading, and then supplement Chaucer by Lydgate. The manuscript belongs not far from Edward IV's time, and the fall of princes was then an absorbing topic.

For textual purposes the MS. is of little value, though excellent for its time.

HENRY NOBLE MACCRACKEN.

Oxford, England.

## A NOTE ON BROWNING.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—In *Caliban on Setebos* Browning uses a peculiar device which he affects nowhere else (except sporadically) in his poems, and which, so far as I have observed, no other writer uses.

It is the employment of the apostrophe at the beginning of a verb to indicate the omission, not of a letter, but of the subject. The omitted subject is in every case Caliban, or a pronoun in the first or third person referring to him. Of the 120 cases in which Caliban makes himself the subject of a verb, the subject is expressed in 78. In the remaining 42 the apostrophe is used 33 times to indicate the omission of the word Caliban or an equivalent in the third person, 6 times to indicate the omission of the first personal pronoun. In three cases a past tense makes it doubtful whether the subject is in the first person or in the third.

What I would especially call attention to, however, is not the device itself, peculiarly Browningsque though it is, but the fact that it is not employed consistently, either as regards its occurrence in the poem, or as regards the different editions of the poem. The first kind of inconsistency can be made apparent by a few examples. I quote from the edition of 1864 :

- 1) 'Say, the first straggler that boasts purple spots  
Shall join the file, one pincer twisted off;  
'Say, this bruised fellow shall receive a worm.
- 2) Vexed, 'stitched a book of broad leaves, arrow-shaped,  
Wrote thereon, he knows what, prodigious words;  
Has peeled a wand and called it by a name;  
Weareth at whiles for an enchanter's robe
- 3) 'Falls to make something : 'piled yon pile of turfs
- 4) Is, not to seem too happy. Sees, himself,  
Yonder two flies, with purple films and pink,  
Bask on the pompion-bell above : kills both.  
'Sees two black painful beetles roll their ball  
On head and tail as if to save their lives :  
Moves them the stick away they strive to clear.

In the first example the verb following the semicolon has the apostrophe; in the second the verbs "Has" and "Weareth," also following semicolons, have no apostrophe. In the third, the verb "piled," following a colon, has the apostrophe; in the fourth the verbs "kills" and "Moves," after the same mark of punctuation, have none. Notice also that the verb "Sees" in the first line of the fourth example is un-apostrophed. The number of such inconsistencies is five.

The variations in the different editions may be shown as follows :

- |      |   |               |
|------|---|---------------|
| 1864 | 'Would teach the reasoning couple what<br>'"must" means |               |
| 1865 | 'Would  |               |
| 1868 | 'Would  |               |
| 1887 | 'Would  |               |
| 1889 | Would   |               |
| 1864 | Is, not to seem too happy.                              | Sees, himself |
| 1865 |   | 'Sees         |
| 1868 |   | 'Sees         |
| 1887 |   | 'Sees         |
| 1889 |   | 'Sees         |

1864 Moves them the stick away they strive to clear

1865 Moves

1868 Moves

1887 'Moves

1889 Moves

If there is in the poem itself any reason for these seeming inconsistencies or for the changes in the different editions, I have not been able to discover it. Perhaps some one, who has given more attention to Browning's idiosyncracies than I have, may be moved to offer an explanation.

I know but three other examples of this use of the apostrophe by Browning : one in *Fra Lippo Lippi*, and two in *The Inn Album*.

FRED NEWTON SCOTT.

University of Michigan.

#### SOME WORDS USED IN *King Leir*.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS :—Notice of a forthcoming edition, in England, of the pre-Shaksperian play of *King Leir*, may lend interest to the following notes concerning words used in that play in somewhat unfamiliar senses. The latest section of the *New English Dictionary*, issued January 1, 1908, cites one line from the *Leir*, under date of 1593, to illustrate the use of the verb *postulate*, meaning 'beg or demand.' This is the sole reference to the play that I have seen in Dr. Murray's work.

#### 1. *Congratulate* = 'requite, recompense.'

"*Leir*. But how shall we *congratulate* their kindnesse?  
*Perillus*. Infaith I know not how sufficiently;  
But the best meane that I can thinke on is this :  
He offer them my dublet in requital."

Under the word *gratulate*, *N. E. D.* cites two references dated 1611 and 1612 respectively, to establish the definition, 'reward or recompense.' I have found no second instance of *congratulate* used in this sense.

#### 2. *Indurable* = 'unendurable, unbearable.'

"ill befitting for your reverend age,  
To come on foot a journey so *indurable*."

*N. E. D.* contains this definition, but the only citation is from Topsell, *Four-footed Beasts*, 1607. As already stated, the *Leir* is about fifteen years earlier.

#### 3. *Disconsolate* = 'make disconsolate.'

"Ah, do not so *disconsolate* yourselfe."

*N. E. D.* quotes the exact words to establish this definition, but attributes them to Yarrington's *Two Lamentable Tragedies*, published in 1601,

where they are actually found. As a matter of fact, Yarrington's play is founded on a murder which occurred in London in August, 1594, while we have the best evidence that *Leir* was on the stage in April, 1594, and was entered for publication in May, 1594. Chances strongly favor the author of *King Leir* as the originator of the line quoted.

4. *Disaster* = 'disastrous.'

"Oh, what *disaster* chauce hath bin the cause,  
To make your cheeks so hollow, spare and leane?"

Similarly in the First Quarto of *Romeo and Juliet*, 1597 :

"Ah Romeo, Romeo, what *disaster* hap  
Hath seuerd thee from thy true Juliet?"<sup>1</sup>

This definition is found in *N. E. D.*, supported by citations from Greene, *Never Too Late*, 1590 ; the play of *Look About You*, 1600 ; and Knolles, *History of the Turks*, 1603.

In any theories as to the authorship of the *Leir*, the vocabulary of the writer should be taken into account.

ROBERT ADGER LAW.

University of Texas.

A SHAKSPEARE REMINISCENCE IN GOETHE'S  
*Iphigenie*.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS :—In the second act of *Iphigenie*, where Orest in utter despair speaks with Pylades and reviews the past, occurs the passage :

Wie oft, wenn still Elektra, meine Schwester,  
Am Feuer in der tiefen Halle sass,  
Drängt' ich beklommen mich an ihren Schoss  
Und starrte, wie sie bitter weinte, sie  
Mit grossen Augen an. Dann sagte sie  
Von unserm hohen Vater viel: wie sehr  
Verlangt' ich, ihn zu sehn, bei ihm zu sein!  
Mich wünscht' ich bald nach Troja, ihn bald her.  
Es kam der Tag . . . 620-628.

The scene here described and the rhythm of this passage kept recurring to my mind, perplexingly, as something very familiar, until the following occurred to me :

Her father lov'd me, oft invited me,  
Still question'd me the story of my life  
From year to year,—the battles, sieges, fortunes,  
That I have pass'd.

This to hear  
Would Desdemona seriously incline :  
I did consent,  
And often did beguile her of her tears,  
My story being done,  
She gave me for my pains a world of sighs:

<sup>1</sup> Furness, *Romeo and Juliet*, p. 336.

She swore, in faith, 't was strange, 't was passing strange,  
'T was pitiful, 't was wondrous pitiful;  
She wish'd she had not heard it, yet she wish'd  
That heaven had made her such a man; she thanked me,  
And bade me, if I had a friend . . .

Upon this hint I spake;

I, 3, 128-166.

The scene in both is similar—an older, experienced person relating a story of wonderful, heroic deeds to a younger, inexperienced person. The effect of the story on the listener is similar—conflicting emotions, conflicting desires, the wish to be able to do the same. The short sentences which form the climax also add to the similarity. But what points to a reminiscence is the employment of the same rhythmic means to describe the psychological state of the listener, the balanced, antithetical rhythm, which is so unusually striking in the passage from *Othello*. Furthermore, we know that Goethe became acquainted with Shakspeare through Dodd's *Beauties of Shakspeare*, which appeared in 1752 ; I was not able to secure this first edition, but the edition of 1818 (London) gives, pp. 322-324, *Othello's* speech entire, and it may be assumed that the first edition, and the edition of 1780 also included this passage, since the unfortunate divine was executed in 1777. It is, of course, impossible to give final proof, that we have here a reminiscence, but it may be found of interest that two master poets have chosen here the same rhythmic means to heighten the description of the same psychological state.

CHARLES JULIUS KULLMER.

Syracuse University.

COLERIDGE'S LINES ON DONNE.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS :—In *The Rhetoric of John Donne's Verse*, pp. 30-32, I call attention to Grosart's mistake in attributing to Hartley Coleridge the lines his father wrote on Donne. After presenting arguments in proof of my assertion that Grosart is mistaken, I quote Henry Nelson Coleridge as definitely settling the matter.

In view of the foregoing, a recent letter from Ernest Hartley Coleridge contains a statement of interest. He says : "My sister, Miss Christabel Coleridge, at whose house I am staying, has in her possession the copy of *Anderson's British Poets* which belonged to S. T. C. and was bequeathed by him to his son Hartley. The volume had passed through Wordsworth's hands and in one or two places had been annotated by him. S. T. C. contributes only one not very important or illustrative note to Donne . . . a foot-note to the lines 'on the Blessed Virgin Mary.' . . . At the end

of the volume [vol. iv, ed. 1793] on a blank page are Hartley's lines beginning

'Brief as the reign of pure poetic Truth'—

and containing these lines which I have copied from the autograph—

'Thus Donne—not first—but greatest of the line—  
Of stubborn thoughts a garland thought to twine ;  
To his fair maid brought cabalistic posies,  
And sang quaint ditties of metempsychosis :  
"Twists iron poker into true love knots,"  
Coining hard words not found in polyglots.'

You will, therefore, see that the quotation made shows Hartley as including in his own verses a line of his father's—and this bears out your contention.

"S. T. C.'s lines were first published in *Literary Remains* in 1836, and there in print most probably Hartley saw them for the first time. His lines were, I think, written in 1843. . . ."

WIGHTMAN F. MELTON.

Baltimore, Md.

#### LONGFELLOW AND THE HEXAMETER.<sup>1</sup>

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS :—When Longfellow published his *Ballads and Other Poems* in 1841 he made in the introduction to his translation of Tegnér's *Children of the Lord's Supper* the following statement :

"I have preserved even the measure, that inexorable hexameter, in which, it must be confessed, the motions of the English muse are not unlike those of a prisoner dancing to the music of his chains ; and perhaps, as Dr. Johnson said of the dancing dog, the wonder is not that she should do it well, but that she should do it at all." It may occasion some surprise to hear a poet speaking thus of a meter in 1841 and resolving to choose it for an original epic in 1845. Such is, however, the case and the poet's conviction was strong enough to triumph over the fears of his best friends. One year later still he declares that same hexameter, which had earlier seemed to him as an oppressor of the language, to be a benefactor in disguise. "The English world," he says, "is not yet alive to the beauties of that meter."

What perhaps suggested to Longfellow that he was to accomplish to some extent at least what Clough and Southey had failed to accomplish? The years 1845, 1846, 1847 abound in instances that show him enthusiastically occupied with the possibilities of the hexameter in English. He talks hexameters with Felton on the street corner ;

he reads a hexameter translation of Homer in *Blackwood*, and praises it ; he ruins an evening with the *Vision of Judgement* and exclaims (yes, even our mild Longfellow!) : "It is enough to damn the author and his hexameters forever!" Where may we look for the initial impulse of these enthusiasms? Perhaps in the reception accorded those first hexameters in the translation of Tegnér (which are by the way crude enough)? Hardly. The deed was not convincing. No one called it out and out a success ; many said it was a failure. Allston wrote without enthusiasm ; Prescott even with pessimism. Felton and Sumner had been so little convinced that they advised a different measure for *Evangeline*. Did an encouraging word come from any important authority? It did. That authority was in Germany, where the admissibility of the hexameter was established by *Hermann und Dorothea*.

On the seventeenth of September, 1842, Longfellow, then in Marienberg, wrote a short letter to Ferdinand Freiligrath, in which occurs a sentence seemingly without especial bearing, unless one happens to be looking for a solution that makes it significant. "Have you seen," he asks, "the *Magazin für ausländische Litteratur*? It has a paragraph on English hexameters, in which an extract is given from my translation of Tegnér." Amid his own doubts and those of his friends the poet found in the paragraph here referred to the unqualified approval of an influential magazine.

"Better than did Southey and Taylor, a modern American poet has succeeded in his attempts in the English hexameter. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, author of *Hyperion*, who has been frequently mentioned in these pages, has favored us, in his recently published *Ballads and Other Poems*, with a translation of the beautiful Swedish poem of Tegnér, the *Children of the Lord's Supper*. As is well known the Swedish tongue is able to reproduce the ancient measure with greater fidelity and fuller tones than even the German. Longfellow has endeavored to imitate the Swedish, and we consider that he has produced the best English hexameters in existence up to the present."

These words would not have been so significant had not the problem of the English hexameter been so long before the world of critics and poets. The former had asserted what the latter had failed to disprove, the impossibility of good hexameters in our language. Here was an excellent opportunity to confound the theories of critics and surpass the attempts of former poets. And the resulting hexameters in *Evangeline*, inevitably tiresome as they are, show a good proportion of the varieties of rhythmic modulation possible to that meter in English.

T. M. CAMPBELL.

Randolph-Macon Woman's College.

<sup>1</sup> Adapted from a dissertation by the writer of this note, entitled : *Longfellow's Wechselbeziehungen zu der deutschen Litteratur*, Leipzig, 1907.